

GANDHI-MUSLIM CONSPIRACY

BY
A HINDU NATIONALIST

Deeds will be done, — while he boasts his quiescence,
Still bidding crouch whom the rest bade aspire ;
Blot out his name, then, record one lost soul more,
One task more declined, one more footpath untrod.

—“ *Lost Leader* ” R. Browning.

Foreword By
Barr. Jamnadas M. Mehta,
Ex-finance Minister, Bombay.

Publishers :
R. D. Ghanekar,
323, Main Street, Poona.

{ All rights reserved by the publishers. }

*Printed by Mr. V. G. Kelkar, at the Lokasangraha Press,
424 Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2 and Published by Mr. R. D. Ghanekar,
323, Main Street, Poona 1.*

FOREWORD

THIS BOOK is a sustained attempt to show that there was in 1920-21 a definite conspiracy to invite the Amir of Afghanistan to invade this country and that Gandhiji and the Ali Brothers were the leaders of that conspiracy, that this conspiracy to establish Muslim Raj in India or at any rate, the mentality behind it still continues, that this fact is conclusively established by Gandhiji's article in the "Harijan" dated the 13th October 1940, that Gandhiji in spite of his absolute sincerity and his undoubted patriotism is the victim of a cruel hallucination which makes him believe, that he is the prophet of a New Age, born to shape erring humanity into the pattern of Truth and Non-violence, that Providence has specially commissioned him to achieve that consummation; that this unconscious, cruel but none the less real self-deception results in making the Mahatma an incorrigible egotist and in creating in his heart an irrepressible craving for a domination over men's minds reckless of consequences and that by this insatiable though unconscious lust for domination he has brought into existence an absolute stalemate in Indian politics, a communal tension in the worst and the most aggravated form, an accentuation of the slave mentality in the masses, a virtual collapse of the intelligentsia and a tightening of foreign fetters round India's feet; but with all that he has achieved his object. Gandhiji is to-day for millions the Mahatma a MESSIAH, a Prophet, the Herald of a New Age and that is what he wanted.

2. The author makes no secret that he is fully convinced of the conspiracy between the Ali Brothers and the Mahatma. This conspiracy, according to the author, was inspired by the excessive religious zeal of the Ali Brothers and it was also the result of the absurd lengths to which the Mahatma was prepared to go in order to purchase, if he could, the support of the Muslims in the pursuit of his role of a phantom Prophetship. The evidence that the author has collected in support of this

conviction is varied. It is largely documented. It is marshalled from the speeches, articles and actions of the main conspirators and of independent onlookers. The full significance of this evidence was not noticed in the years 1920-21; or rather the Afghan intrigue was considered so patriotic during the political excitement of those days that the menace to India's freedom involved therein was ignored. But the evidence challenges attention. Any attempt to brush it aside will be a fatal error.

3. The ardent devotees of the Mahatma will be shocked by the contents of this book. They will very likely raise their hands in horror at the 'impudence' of the writer and probably worse of the writer of this Foreword. They will consider this publication a sacrilege, profane beyond conception. To their believing minds nothing will appear more impossible, nothing more false or malicious than to attribute such conduct to the Mahatma. To charge the "Apostle of the New Age" with the heinous crime of treachery to his own country and especially to the followers of his own professed Faith, would appear to them to be the work of malice or perversity or both. Even the detached reader will be inclined to be sceptical. But the book is not to be dismissed in such supercilious fashion.

4. It should of course be obvious that the Mahatma cannot be consciously guilty of any such crime against his country, that Gandhiji, the champion of Truth and Non-violence, the one Indian who stood up to the racial arrogance of the Africander, who has raised the moral stature of the Indian people since 1920-21 by exhorting them to be courageous at the cost of their lives, who first taught India the apparently formidable but really futile weapon of resistance to the mighty British Empire in the form of Civil Disobedience—is it even conceivable, millions will ask, that such a superman could have perpetrated a foul act of treachery to his country and its people?

*5. And yet there is little doubt that such apparent contradictions are perfectly compatible. Leaders of any movement with the spirit of crusaders in them are quite frequently men of unusual disinterestedness. They will be prepared,

*With acknowledgments to *Bertrand Russell* (Vide his book 'Roads to Freedom')—

in pursuit of their ideals to suffer untold hardships and to rise to unparalleled heights of sacrifice. Wealth, reputation and exalted careers could be at their feet, but they will disdain them for the cause. Whatever errors occur in the details in their personal lives they are, where the cause is concerned, as clear as crystal. These pioneers, for the best part of their lives, experience prison and exile which they deliberately invite. By example and precept they show to the world that the hope which inspired their conduct was not for themselves but for mankind. Such undoubtedly is the Mahatma.

*6. Nevertheless though the desire for human welfare is what determines the broad lines of the action of such men, their method of work once formed becomes wooden and it makes them dogmatic, intolerant and even fanatical. They become embittered by the opposition and disappointments which they encounter in their endeavour to bring happiness to the world. The more certain they are of the purity of their motives and the truth of their gospel, the more indignant will they become when their preaching is rejected or opposed. Often, they will successfully achieve an attitude of philosophic tolerance as regards apathy of the masses and even as regards the wholehearted opposition of professed defenders of the status quo. But the men whom they find it impossible to forgive are those who profess the same desire for amelioration of society as they feel themselves and yet do not accept their method of achieving better. The intense faith which enables them to withstand prosecution for the sake of their belief makes them consider these beliefs to be so luminously obvious that any thinking men who reject them must be dishonest and actuated by some sinister motive of treachery to the cause. Hence arises that spirit of the sect, that bitter, narrow, orthodoxy amongst these leaders of mankind. The personal ambition which they ruthlessly mortify and suppress in the choice of their career is reborn in another form. It returns to them in a conviction of their infallibility. The men who have sacrificed most for the benefit of mankind appear to be actuated by an implacable hatred of

*With acknowledgments to *Bertrand Russell* (Vide his book 'Roads to Freedom').

the opponent and by a determination for intellectual domination; while preaching freedom of thought they insist on a conformity which stifles free exercise of thought. Those who have begun with a determination to fight for freedom end by becoming themselves despotic. The ambition for wealth, power and authority so carefully smothered and suppressed and an intense desire for the freedom of the country so religiously cherished by the Mahatma have brought about a subtle and insidious hallucination in him that he is the modern MESSIAH, that Nature and Providence have commissioned him to be so and that those who do not accept his mission must be condemned as faithless and must therefore be destroyed. The Mahatma has brought to bear on his mission a new and characteristic strategy. He has been able successfully to conceal his hatred and prejudices against his opponents under the lofty poses of Love, Truth and Non-violence and by the amazing gentleness of his language towards them. This ostentatious deference to his adversaries serves his purpose and often turns the adversary into an ardent admirer. But the whole strategy is a mask, unconscious but a mask still. The method of defeating the adversary is deadly in its precision. And all this is superimposed by a spectacular austerity of life. The result is not in doubt. The trick is done. The magic tells. The adversary is duped and the conjuror carries the day. Mr. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi becomes the Mahatma.

7. To penetrate behind this veil of saintliness which conceals a relentless purpose requires no small degree of patient research and courage. The author possesses both these; he has come forward to tear the mask with a resolute will that will not be diverted of its purpose.

8. In 1914, after his abortive attempt in London to help the British Government in the last world war, and having already before that time said farewell to South Africa, the Mahatma returned to India with the hallucination that he was destined to become a Prophet. He started his mission with the determination to destroy all who stood in his way always under the guise of the most high sounding doctrines. It will be remembered that he began by professing to be an humble follower of the

late Mr. Gokhale and thus insinuated himself with the Liberals so successfully that many of them began to believe that whatever the faults of the Mahatma he was at least honest and that he was therefore to be preferred to the Tilakite school whose methods both the Liberals and the Mahatma considered to be not free from blame. By thus ingratiating himself in their favour he destroyed the Liberal Party in the course of a few years. So subtle was the process that some of the followers of the late Mr. Gokhale were apt to regard the Mahatma to be an unofficial member of the Servants of India Society. I wonder whether they do so now. I do not wish to speculate what the late Mr. Gokhale himself would have thought, if he could come to life again, of a follower who has destroyed the old Indian National Congress of 1885 and in its place has set up a dictatorship with its monstrosities of "*the blank cheque*" and "*neither support nor oppose*" theories. Everybody knows that the Liberal Party has become today the shadow of its former self, if it is not wholly destroyed, largely through the Mahatma.

9. He next professed an intense admiration for the late Lokmanya Tilak and although he found it difficult to swallow the latter in the beginning, he persisted in his efforts in his own subtle manner and expressed the highest regard for the intellectual supremacy of the late Lokmanya, thereby suggesting that the ethical argument was on the Mahatma's side. A lofty moral pose proclaimed from the house-top, although honoured more in the breach than in observance, struck the unwary into mute admiration and weakened the opponent. So long as Lokmanya was alive, the Mahatma preferred on the whole to lie low, but nevertheless went on with his clever game of mud-throwing against that great man. Unhappily in 1920, Lokmanya Tilak died and the Mahatma got the chance of a life-time. He paid the most flattering compliments to the memory of Lokmanya Tilak, started what is called the Tilak Swarajya Fund and collected a crore of rupees in order ostensibly to perpetuate his memory but really to destroy it. It is common knowledge that every single one of this crore of rupees was spent in artfully discrediting and treacherously stabbing Lokmanya Tilak's

philosophy. With that sum, he created vested interests for his so-called philosophy of faith against reason. When the Mahatma cannot subdue, he cajoles and coaxes until his victims themselves get trapped by his strategy. Rabindranath Tagore, Shastri, Sapru, Malaviyaji, Radhakrishnan and many more are the victims of this strategy. When coaxing fails, he would stoop still further to conquer and appear to yield as he did in the case of Deshbandhu Das and Motilal Nehru, both of whom he ultimately swallowed. Those who still survive his tactics, he follows with the implacable love of the Mahatmic type, as in the case of the whole of the Tilakite school, Mrs. Beasant, Messrs. Vithalbhaji Patel, Nariman, Khare, Bose, Roy and innumerable other patriotic leaders and workers. If you are not still destroyed he follows the curious alternative of bluff as against the British Government and a grovelling attitude as towards the Muslims. He claims to be a great admirer of the British people. They welcome this compliment but are not deceived. For the Muslims, he claims unbounded love and friendship. He would rather die in the hands of Dr. Ansari than survive in the hands of Dr. Moonje. There is nothing he would not do for the Muslims and the notorious blank-cheque-theory owes its origin to the tactics of this kind. He would remain silent over the most atrocious outrages perpetrated by fanatical Muslims on innocent Hindus; massacres, murders, kidnappings, sacrileges on temples—all these he would silently accept with that hateful smile which is so admired by his faithful chelas. But the Muslims are not deceived either.

10. Many of these Mahatmic traits are fully brought out in the pages of this publication. Readers of this book are likely to feel that the author, sometimes, uses unduly strong language, that his indictment of the Mahatma has too much adjectival flavour in it and that it would have lost nothing of its force and cogency if it had been couched in milder language; but the author will argue that the evasiveness and elusiveness of the Mahatma leave him no option and he will be able to show that older and more moderate people have also felt impelled to write equally strongly of the Mahatma's contradictions and somersaults.

Even a reasoned statesman like the late Sir Sankaran Nair, an ex-president of the Indian National Congress, was driven to refer to the Mahatma as "either a fool or a knave." Personally I think there is no difference between a fool and a knave. A knave is in the long run a fool, and a fool can do as much harm as a knave. But I would earnestly request the reader to subordinate the question of the language used and to read the facts and the evidence which the author marshals from various independent sources in order to support the conclusion of the conspiracy that he seeks to draw. Men like Col. Josiah Wedgwood, the late Rev. C. F. Andrews, Pandit Malaviya, Mr. Shastri, newspapers like the 'Leader' and the 'Madras Express,' to mention only a few, have drawn, as this book shows, more or less the same conclusion, in different words it may be, as the author of this book has done.

11. It is unquestionable that the amazing elasticity of the Mahatma's mind and conscience makes him say and do the most contradictory things. With the profound air of saintliness he will support two contradictory conclusions if that suits his purpose for the time being; in the eye of his admirers he increases his saintliness thereby. With non-violence on his lips and in his pen, he was acting as a recruiting sergeant for the British in the war of 1914-18. At Amritsar, he was urging the Congress to utilise the new reforms. In 1920, he was preparing for an election campaign under the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms and was laying down the most meticulous rules as to what kind of candidates should be supported. But as soon as Lala Lajpat Rai in a moment of indignation against the Dyer atrocities at Jalianwala Bag, suggested the boycott of the councils, the Mahatma jumped at the idea and made it his own as he saw that the launching of such non-co-operation would help him with his Muslim friends as the Hindu defender of the Khilafat. At the second Round Table Conference he declared most unequivocally that he would rather die than allow untouchability to be placed on the statute book. And in 1932 he purchased his life with the help of the Gandhi-Ambedkar pact which firmly establishes untouchability on the statute book and so it stands there. At the time of

the earth-quake in Bihar in 1934, he boldly declared with incredible cynicism that the Behar tragedy which resulted in innumerable number of children including even non-Hindu children being buried alive was due to the anger of God against the presence of untouchability amongst the Hindus. He would advise the world to surrender to any aggressor rather than resist him by counter force. And yet he would declare when it suits him that he would look with indifference on anarchy. He "neither supports nor opposes" the communal electorates—whatever that may mean. He has given seven mutually destructive definitions of Swaraj and when I pointed this out at the Karachi Congress in 1931, he threatened to increase that number to twenty. He wants freedom and independence for India. But he would stand aside when the Amir of Afghanistan invades India and would even welcome the Nizam as the Emperor of India. He would stand for a united Indian Nation, but at the same time he would not mind Pakistan if the Muslims wanted it. He does not want the domination of one race or community by another but he considers the Nizam's rule as "Cent per cent Swaraj." He hates tyranny but would welcome a tyrant provided the tyrant is a swadeshi one. The objection is apparently not to tyranny but to its foreign origin. An indigenous tyrant will mean "cent per cent swaraj" to the Mahatma. This amounts almost to saying that if an Indian tiger devours the Mahatma he would prefer it to an attack by a foreign tiger. A snake may safely bite him, so runs the Mahatmic argument, if it is only an *Indian* snake. It would require a whole volume to point out many more such absurdities. But the more numerous the absurdities the greater is the admiration of his followers.

12. In order to secure the support of the Muslims he will pamper them to any extent. But the Muslims also like the British are not deceived. The Mahatma started with the support to Khilafat in 1920, and has continued this pampering for the next twenty years with ever increasing vigour. But the result was no better. In 1921, he got his reward in the Mopla atrocities in Malabar and in 1940 in the Sukkur massacre in Sind with many intervals of similar atrocities in almost every part of India. But his

infatuation has not ended. We had paraded before us the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity as a part of the Mahatma's constructive programme and also as the precursor of Swaraj. But we have instead of achieving the unity, very nearly achieved Pakistan and the champion of the Hindu-Muslim unity is now an avowed supporter of Pakistan if the Muslims but *want* it. He will make a mountain out of a mole-hill at Rajkot but in Hyderabad with a hundred times more population he will allow tyranny to go on unchallenged. For Mr. Jinnah, the Mahatma shows a respect which is alike hypocritical and degrading but Vinayak Savarkar does not even so much as exist for the self than Mahatma.

13. This is the correct picture of the Mahatma's mental make-up. With such background there is nothing to wonder if the Mahatma allowed himself to be associated remotely it may be, indirectly it may be, with the move to support a foreign invasion of his own country. Is he not prepared to welcome Pakistan if the Muslims *want* it as already stated? Has he not supported the communal electorates? Has he not, academically it may be, declared that the Nizam as the future Emperor of India has no terrors for him? Is he not the author of the notorious blank-cheque-theory? Has he not with supreme indifference watched in Bengal, the Frontier Province and elsewhere the slaughter of the Hindus, the abductions of Hindu women and the similar other outrages? Is he not in short prepared to go to any length if only the Mussalmans accept him as their leader? Is there any surprise therefore if when religious zeal had reached a fever-point and when the Mussalmans were in need of all the support that the Hindus could give them in their misfortune, that the Mahatma should even support an invasion of India if only thereby he becomes the undisputed leader of Hindus and Muslims alike? There is therefore nothing inherently impossible in the Mahatma's support to a contemplated invasion of India. That is the argument of the author of this book.

14. The main theme of this book can be conveniently divided into two parts. First, whether the Mahatma did encourage the idea of an invasion of India by the Amir of

Afghanistan and whether he was also a party to an actual invitation to the Amir to do so. The difference between the two is not great, but I prefer to deal with them separately. There is irrefutable evidence that he did actually encourage an invasion of India by the Amir and even declared that he did not care if the Amir came. He went further and said that he would ask the Indian people not to assist the Government of India in resisting such an invasion. Whether the draft of the telegram said to have been sent to the Amir requesting him not to make peace with the Government of India but to carry on the Third Afghan War was in the Mahatma's hand or not may be impossible to ascertain now. But so high an authority as the late Swami Shraddhanand says, "What was my astonishment when I saw the draft of the selfsame telegram in the peculiar handwriting of the father of the Non-violent Non-co-operation Movement." Those who want to know the truth will hesitate before saying that such a piece of evidence should be ignored.

15. The Afghan intrigue first came to light through a public speech by Maulana Mohamed Ali in Madras in 1921 declaring unequivocally that if the Amir of the Afghans invaded India, he would assist the Amir; when it was feared that the Maulana would be arrested for making such a treasonable and unpatriotic statement the Mahatma declared that the Ali Brothers had done nothing what he himself would not do. He admitted that his article in 'Young India' did amount to an invitation to the Amir to start an invasion. Mr. Andrews, who was such an intimate friend of the Mahatma, told him that the said article bore the interpretation of an invitation to invade. The Mahatma admitted that accusation as true. The Mahatma himself therefore pleads guilty to the first charge.

16. From these and several other facts stated in this book, I am satisfied that the Mahatma's writings and speeches in those days did lend themselves to the very well-founded accusation that he had supported the Ali Brothers in their intrigue to the extent of not opposing the invasion. The Mahatma does come out in this matter as an abettor if not the actual perpetrator. The evidence on the second point is not copious

and is also indirect. Except the statement of Sir William Vincent, the then Home-Member there is nothing *direct* to prove an invitation to invade. In order however that no doubt whatever should be left on this second issue it has been suggested that the Hindu Mahasabha to appoint a committee of inquiry on which it should invite two Hindus, two Muslims, one Parsi, one Sikh and one Christian. They should sift the evidence after inviting the Mahatma to make his own statement if any and then on the strength of the evidence and the circumstances attending the events of those days, the Committee should make up its mind whether the Mahatma had or had not any hand in the move to invite the Amir of Afghanistan to invade India. I think however, that no useful purpose will be served by such an inquiry twenty years after the event when the principal actors in the drama are not alive and when the Mahatma himself has denied the charge in his own Mahatmic manner.

17. I have dealt with the main points raised in this book. It now remains to add that the evil atmosphere which has been generated by the Mahatma's endeavours to become a Prophet, has totally demoralised the public life of India. The Mussalmans whom he chooses to pamper in every possible way have taken him at his word and their fanatical section have not only grasped everything that he could give but are asking for more. They now want India to be cut into two pieces under the new fangled scheme of Pakistan. The stand taken is not merely the protection of a minority in a self-governing India but a two-nations theory—nations so entirely distinguished from each other in culture and outlook that not only they are distinct entities today but must remain so till the end of time. In effect this scheme is a crude attempt to foment a civil war in India and to keep it perpetually going. The minorities in each federated section are to remain hostages for the good conduct of the majorities in the other federated areas. It is conveniently forgotten that if the Muslim minority can demand a Pakistan in India, the Sikh and Hindu minorities in the so-called Pakistan will by a parity of reasoning be entitled to demand a similar dis-

memberment of Pakistan itself. Why the Hindu and the Sikh majorities in certain districts of Pakistan should not claim separation we are not told. The fact is, that the scheme is a result of a shallow mind whose ambition has got the better of his reason. Mr. Jinnah's conceit prevents him from standing shoulder to shoulder with his equals and he loves to rule in Pakistan rather than serve in Hindusthan. The British Government in the throes of a most serious war is anxious to keep the Indian Muslims in good humour and the Muslim Powers outside India in an attitude of friendly neutrality. They have therefore remained conveniently silent over the Pakistan issue and have not hesitated to give it even a covert support. But if India is not to be divided into warring provinces as China was at one time, if the unselfish endeavours of patriotic Indians for the last fifty years are not to be stultified, if democracy is not to be smothered in the name of minority protection, if a minority is not to be permitted to veto and hold up the progress of 400 million people, if fanaticism is not to receive a premium and if the British Government possess even one shred of honesty in dealing with this country, then this monstrous doctrine of Pakistan should be laid low by its prompt and indignant repudiation.

18. The author of this book is seriously oppressed with the feeling that no matter what attempts the Hindus might make to live as citizens of a common country along with their Muslim fellow countrymen the Pakistanwallas are too fanatical to appreciate the broader standpoint. It will be futile to say that there is not much in our country at the present which does not support this conclusion nor will it be wise to ignore the menace to India's territorial integrity. And yet I have always cherished the belief that the founders of the Indian National Congress were far-sighted statesmen, that they really believed in an Indian Nation of the future and that despite religious and racial differences India was destined one day to become a united nation, strong, tolerant, patriotic, religious without being fanatical. The whole history of the United States of America has lent hope to such a conviction. The thirteen crores of Americans are not of one race nor of one religion. The present European war

shows how bitter racial feuds are among the European countries, how Christian nations do not hesitate to slaughter one another, how the Poles, the Germans, the Russians, the Bulgarians, the Italians, the French, the Spanish and the innumerable Balkan and Baltic States are ready at a hint to fly at the throat of one another and butcher them without mercy, how the Roman Catholic hanged and quartered the Protestant in the middle ages, how the Latin and Non-Latin races in Europe have considered each other as their age-long enemies, how the Scotch killed the English and how the English murdered the Scottish people and yet in the continent of America particularly the United States these self-same races have managed for centuries to live together in peace and have consolidated themselves into one nation, richer and more powerful than any other. If this is what could be accomplished in America, there is no reason why the faith of the founders of Indian National Congress should not achieve a similar consummation in this country. Provided we abjure fanaticism, the Hindus and Muslims can still become a united nation, and I am certain that that is also the faith of the Sikh, the Christians, the Parsi, the Jew and the smaller minorities. It would be wrong to ignore their views and to consider that they are so much chattel, rather than they are fellow citizens whose voice should receive the most tender consideration. Not one of these latter wants a Pakistan and no other sensible Indian wants it. There are enough cultured and patriotic Muslims like Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan who think in the same direction but their voice is drowned in the dirge of the fanatic. If the ostentatious generosity of the Mahatma were replaced by a truly nationalist outlook in the Congress, if the British Government could be made to realise that the game of divide and rule was up, if the minorities could be reassured by all legitimate or rational concessions to secure them against any conceivable wrong without giving a go-bye to the essentials of democracy, India may yet be saved from Gandhism and the sacred idea of a united nation in India conceived by the founders of the Indian National Congress and fostered by patriots like Lokmanya Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Pandit Motilal Nehru,

Deshbandhu Das, Vithalbhair Patel, Kelkar and others may yet become practical politics.

Ridge Road, Malbar Hill, }
Bombay, 14th February, 1941 }

Jamnadas M. Mehta

PREFACE

THE IDEA of compiling this book and publishing it before the Madura Session of the Hindu Mahasabha was suggested to the author in October last, while he was engaged in writing a series of articles on this problem in 'Kesari.' The task of preparing the press copy was finished in the first week of December and it was rushed through the press within two weeks; but Barr. Jamnadas M. Mehta, who had kindly promised to introduce this book to the public could not spare sufficient time for this work in that busy month; and therefore we had to postpone the date of publication. Many of our friends thought that we would not be fortunate enough to get his introduction. But in spite of their fears we decided to wait. And it was a wise decision, for the forceful Foreword of Barr. Jamnadas M. Mehta, would now be one of the most important features of this book. The support of such a prominent personality emboldens us to face our opponents without any anxiety. By writing this outspoken Foreword he has rendered a great service to our nation. We, as well as the public owe him a deep debt of gratitude. Dr. Raghuveer of Lahore has kindly given us permission to reprint his article on 'True Nationalism' from the 'Mahratta.' The chapter on the Partition of India was translated from the original Marathi by the editor of the 'Mahratta' and was published in that journal. Barr. Savarkar's article on Hyderabad was originally published in the 'Mahratta.' For the permission of reprinting these and various other items we must thank Mr. G. V. Ketkar, the editor of the paper. Mr. Deo, the assistant librarian of the Servants of India Society lent us the rare old files of 'The Leader', 'The Citizen', 'The People', etc. Without his help the author could not have prepared this formidable charge-sheet. Mr. Barve the assistant librarian of the K. M. Library was equally helpful. The sixty pages comprising the chapters from 'Wartime Treachery' to 'Muslim Raj in India' have been freely translated from our articles in Kesari by Prof. V. V. Dixit. The open letter, Gandhiji's surrender to the

Muslims, and the conclusion were written in collaboration with a young scholar who has obtained the fellowship of his College. He prefers to remain anonymous.

Now one word about the book itself. We know that the book will shock the ordinary readers. But they should remember that a schism in a decaying Empire regularly splits the society within its sphere of influence into the same three fractions—the ruling class, the Have-nots within the border and the Have-nots on and adjoining the border. The Have-nots within the border further split themselves into two sections, the one trying to overthrow the ruling class by violence and the other by non-violence. The violent section conspires with the frontier and trans-frontier Have-nots to overthrow the ruling class and the non-violent section paves the way for the foreign enemy by preaching the immorality of self-defence. This is an invariable law of history. In India the frontier and trans-frontier Have-nots are represented by the wild border tribes and Afghanistan. The Have-nots within the border are represented by the combination of the Pacifists, the Pan-Islamists and the Marxists. The Pan-Islamists and the Marxists have been intriguing with the foreign enemy for the last twenty years at least; and the Pacifists under the leadership of Gandhiji have been preaching the benefits to be derived from a policy of surrender. This open conspiracy in our country thrives because of the mistaken conception that economic self-interest is the fundamental motive in human society. If the country believes in that theory sooner or later it will be delivered to the tender mercies of the wild border tribes, and their kinsmen in Afghanistan. The principle of cultural nationalism alone can prevent this disaster. Those who pretend to strive for self-government must show some respect to the principle of Government itself. Preaching anarchy is not the way to self-government.

The Author.

CONSPIRACY?



CONTENTS

	PAGE
An open Letter to Gandhiji	1
True Nationalism	22
Intrigues with Hyderabad	27
Surrender to Muslims	45
Shraddhanand v/s Gandhiji	52
Pre-war Conspiracies of the Indian Muslims...	64
Wartime Treachery	69
Tilak v/s Gandhi	78
Origin of Khilafat Movement	85
Afghan Emissaries	92
Muslim Raj in India	118
The Afghan Menace	129
Afghans and Partition of India	136
Nationalist Muslims	155
Conclusion	177
Appendix : Evidences	187

1. Mr. Shastri Interviewed ...	177
2. India and Afghanistan ...	178
3. The Afghan Question ...	182
4. Mr. Mohamed Ali and Jihad ...	188
5. Mr. Mohamed Ali's Explanation ...	191
6. 'Madras Mail' on Mohamed Ali ...	198
7. The Alleged Afghan Spy ...	201
8. Mr. Abul Kalam Azad's Views ...	203
9. Lala Lajpat Rai on 'Afghan Bogey' ...	205
10. The Story of the Afghan Spy ...	206
11. 'Leader' on Amir's Denial ...	207
12. A. I. C. C. : Congress Foreign Policy...	208
13. The Menace of Muslim Raj ...	210
14. Soviet Intrigues on Indian Frontier ...	212
15. Gandhi's Hatred for Tilak ...	214
16. Change in Muslim View-point ...	215
17. Let Hindus Learn ! ...	216
18. This Wretched Award ...	217
19. Gandhi's Truth ...	218
20. India's Case for Swaraj ...	219

AN OPEN LETTER TO GANDHIJI

Dear Gandhiji,

In a cricket season a well-known professor of the New Poona College confided to his students that although he could not play cricket, he could talk on cricket for hours. That forgotten incident occurred to me as I took up my pen to address you this open letter. You have been talking on truth for years; but unfortunately you have rarely spoken it. And yet you resent any attack on your precious reputation, although you have never had the courage to face a fair and honest scrutiny of your hypocritical life. In your reply to my charges you have said that life for you would be a burden if you were to make it a point of controverting every false report about you or a distortion of your writing. I do not desire to add to your burdens. I am asking you simply to unburden your conscience if indeed you possess any conscience at all at present. For it is suspected that you have already sold it when you entered into an unholy alliance with the Ali Brothers, to stir up an Afghan invasion against the Government of India.

In the 'Harijan' of 10-2-40, you have declared that so far as the charge of your int the Amir is concerned there is no truth whatever. In this connection I deem it necessary to bring to your own injunction to the non-co-operators. enough for a non-co-operator not to mean violence. It is necessary that his speech must not be capable of interpretation by reasonable men." (15-6-1921 'V'

I am going to apply the same maxim to your intrigues with the Amir. I hope, you will concede that the Right Honourable Mr. Shrinivas Shastri is a reasonable man. May I remind you that Mr. Shastri was the first person to suggest that the leaders of the non-co-operation movement who were loudly declaring from public platforms that the Moderates were guilty of high treason to the people, were themselves guilty of high treason. I will cite his exact words from the 'Leader' of 11-4-1921.

"I am aware of the old, old anti-thesis between treason to the people and treason to the king, with which strong propagandists can make effective play, but I am not frightened. I will content myself with pleading not guilty of either form of treason and expressing the hope that my critics could do the same without violating their conscience."

Mr. Shastri was too generous in supposing that traitors who were active in stirring up a foreign enemy could have any conscience; but as to the treasonable tendencies of the non-co-operators, he was perfectly right. In his interview Mr. Shastri had also stated:

"Fears are entertained. we can only hope they are unfounded that the frontier and transfrontier troubles are in part at least encouraged and stimulated by the unprecedented unrest caused by the non-co-operation movement. It sounds a strong thing to say and I have no facts on which to proceed, but there is nothing inherently improbable in a powerful movement designed to overthrow Government though only by peaceful means, being regarded by aliens as a propitious occasion, for their aggressive schemes."

Here Mr. Shastri has explained only the indirect connection between the non-co-operation movement and the transfrontier troubles. But Sir William Vincent, the then Home Member, has revealed some facts showing the direct connection between the leaders of the non-co-operation movement and the transfrontier enemies. In a meeting of the Legislative Assembly, on 23-3-1921 he has stated:

“Can any Hon’ble Member say, however, that the co-adjutors and lieutenants of Mr. Gandhi act on the same peaceful principles, whether they are actuated by the same motives? Has that ever been seriously believed by any non-official who has been in contact with some of Mr. Gandhi’s lieutenants recently? Let us take the case of two prominent Muslims who identify themselves with the case of Mr. Gandhi. Has it not been freely bruited abroad rightly or wrongly that they conceive the idea of a Mussalman Empire in this country? Has it not even been said that they intend to effect this with the aid of foreign enemies? Has it not even been said that they contemplate an invasion of this country by a foreign power within a couple of months, which invasion Muslims inside this country are to aid? If there is nothing in all these rumours why was then this anxiety recently to prevent friendly negotiations being arranged between the Amir of Afghanistan and the British Government? Was it not rather a curious attitude to take up?”

You had attacked this speech of Sir William in an article called “Divide and Rule” and yet you had evaded a direct reply to the explicit charges that he had made. We agree, that it was his policy to divide and rule and hence he did not reveal your share in these conspiracies with foreign enemies. That you were involved in these conspiracies is proved from your interview to the ‘Daily Express,’ in which you referred “to preparations that were then made in Afghanistan as being really in support of the Khilafat.” That you were aware of the preparations for the invasion of India by the Afghans on the pretext of the Khilafat, is obvious from the above interview given in April 1921. This is one of those evidences, I suppose, which proves that there is no truth whatever in the charge of your intriguing with the Amir! In 1922 Sir Shankaran Nair had exclaimed “But for the fact that he (Mr. Gandhi) is well-known to be a saint and Mahatma, I would have had no hesitation in saying that his observations about meeting the Afghans show him to be either a fool or a knave.” After the experience of so many years I have come to the conclusion that not only you are not a fool but a most dangerous one

and an expert in the science of fooling other people. It is a bitter thing to say but I cannot avoid it. When the situation on the frontier was extremely critical and when according to a statement of Mr. Montagu, the total casualties of British forces on the North West Frontier of India from the 1st January 1919 to the 30th of April 1921 amounted to 8,472 including 5,169 killed, 2,474 wounded and 829 missing, you were writing in 'Young India,'

"I warn the reader against believing in the bogey of an Afghan invasion. A weak, disarmed, helpless, credulous India does not know how this Government has kept her under hypnotic spell. Even some of the best of us today really believe that the military budget is being piled up for protecting India against foreign invasion." (4-5-1921)

Your last sentence was a left-handed fling at Mr. Shastri for having said that the non-co-operation movement had its own share in the piling up of figures in the military budget. This is an instance of your truthfulness, I suppose.

To lie and to give false and psuedo-heroic promises to the public has by now become a second nature to you. In your recent article on Hyderabad in the 'Harijan' of 13-10-40 you have promised to die in the anarchic flame whilst vainly attempting to still it with your tiny, shaky hands. Before starting the Khilafat movement you had given us a similar promise.

"I will co-operate wholeheartedly with the Muslim friends in the prosecution of their just demands so long as they act with sufficient restraint and so long as I feel sure that they do not wish to resort to or countenance violence. I should cease to co-operate and advise every Hindu and for that matter everyone else to cease to co-operate, the moment there was violence actually done, advised or countenanced. The cause is doomed if anger, hatred, ill-will, wrecklessness and finally violence is to reign supreme. I shall resist them with my life even if I should stand alone." (‘Young India’ 10-3-1920)

The way in which you belied the above promise can well be ascertained from your article in 'Young India,' 13-4-21.

"It is no use isolating me from the rest. As Maulana Mahomed Ali often puts it, war is bad but there are worse things than war. The Brothers are honestly and industriously endeavouring to secure a peaceful settlement. But should their effort prove vain either for want of response from the Government or the people as lovers of their faith they will not hesitate to precipitate war if they could. As for my own attitude, whilst my faith would not permit me to invite or encourage a war of violence, I do contemplate with equanimity a state of war in preference to the present state of eliminate peace imposed by force of arms. And it is for that reason that I am taking part in this movement of non-violent non-co-operation even at the risk of ~~being~~ being the ultimate result."

India against those who have emasculated Islam and who are in wrongful possession of the Holy Places etc. I think Indian opinion is divided on this question. The Moderates are bent upon crushing any such movement. Even the nationalists such as Lala Lajpat Rai and Messrs. Das and Malaviya have not spoken out their mind, nay even you have not taken any notice of this very important speech. It may be high treason to show sympathy and give open assistance to the king's enemy, but in these days of frank talk and candid speech one is eager to hear the decision of leaders. It is a vital question."

This letter proves conclusively that according to an average Muslim, Maulana Mahomed Ali was preaching high treason from public platforms and that they expected you to do the same in the press. I suppose, even you would concede that this infamous letter amounted to an overt invitation to you to commit the crime of high treason. The very fact that such a letter was addressed to you denotes that reasonable people rightly suspected you of treasonable activities.

And immediately afterwards you provided them with irrefutable evidence on this point. At the Allahabad District Conference, held on 10-5-1921 you declared openly,

"I cannot understand why the Ali Brothers are going to be arrested as the rumour goes, and why I am to remain free. They have done nothing which I would not do. If they had sent a message to the Amir, I also would send one to inform the Amir, that if he came no Indian, so long as I can help it, would help the Government to drive him back. If a man is true to his religion no Afghan or any power on earth can make him transgress his religious precepts."

This speech of yours as reported by the 'Leader' clearly proves that on the 10th of May 1921 you were aware of the impending arrest of the Ali Brothers and of the veritable reason for that decision of the Government, namely, their treasonable message to the Amir, and also that you were at that time prepared to send a similar message to the same enemy of India, in order to prove your solidarity with the conspiring

Ali Brothers. It also proves that the message sent to the Amir by Maulana Mahomed Ali with your approval was really an invitation to the Amir to invade India, and that you were canvassing in favour of the Afghans by assuring the Hindus that Afghan domination need not necessarily mean the destruction of Hinduism. In the search-light of these damning revelations, Swami Shraddhanand's modest accusations pale into insignificance. In order to enable you to compare your own confessions with the late Swamiji's accusations I am transcribing that familiar passage once more.

"Maulana Mahomed Ali complained about political leaders taking him to task for sending a wire to the Sultan of Kabul, urging him not to make peace with the British Government. I too urged that it was not a wise step that he had taken. Brother Mahomed Ali took me aside and taking out a paper from his handbag gave a draft of a telegram to me to read. What was my astonishment when I saw the draft of the selfsame telegram in the peculiar handwriting of the father of the non-violent non-co-operation movement!"

When this passage was brought to your notice you gave the following false explanation in the 'Harijan' of 10-2-1940,

"I do not remember having drafted any telegram on behalf of Maulana Mahomed Ali to the then Amir. The alleged telegram is harmless in itself and does not warrant the deduction drawn from it. The late Swamiji never referred the matter to me for confirmation."

The late Swamiji's information about the dangerous character and the authorship of the alleged telegram was strikingly confirmed by your speech at the Allahabad District Conference at which he himself was present and, therefore, he might not have felt it necessary to refer the matter to you for confirmation. I think, if any reasonable man studies the documents in question, he must concede that I have proved my charge to the hilt as Barr. Savarkar has generously put it. If in spite of this you wish to persist in denying the charge of intriguing with the Amir, I can only say that you are at

liberty to deny the truth and be damned. As regards your assurance that the Hindus need not necessarily lose their religion on account of Afghan domination, I must say that I regard it as a piece of disgusting hypocrisy. You should have given that assurance to the Muslims who were striving to recover their Holy Places from the Christian Powers. No sane Hindu can attach any value to such an absurd statement, so long as the tragic history of Muslim Rule in India has not been sufficiently distorted by your henchmen like Dr. Rajendra Prasad.

The name of Dr. Rajendra Prasad reminds me of a forgotten confession of yours which has been intentionally suppressed by that honourable man. You too have conveniently ignored it in the present controversy. I refer to the admissions that you made, while answering ostensibly Mr. Andrews, but in truth Lord Reading, the then Viceroy, in 'Young India.' You have conveniently forgotten it as Dr. Rajendra Prasad has taken good care to omit your admission from the published volumes of 'Young India.' On page 718 of 'Young India,' Babu Rajendra summarises your answer to Andrews as follows :

"On Mr. Andrews asking Mr. Gandhi whether the above article was not an invitation to the Afghans to invade India and whether thereby he did not become a party to violence Mr. Gandhi wrote in 'Young India' of 18th May 1921 denying that he invited Afghans, expressing his anxiety that they should not go to India's assistance and affirming that India was quite capable of settling with the Government without extraneous aid."

I ask you if this is a fair summary of your answer as appearing in the original files of 'Young India.'

"Is not my article on the Afghan Bogey an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border and thus do I not become a direct party to violence?" Thus asks Mr. Andrews. "My article was written for Indians and for the Government. I do not believe the Afghans to be so foolish

as to invade India on the strength of my article. *But I see that it is capable of bearing the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Andrews. I therefore hasten to inform all whom it may concern, that not only do I not want to invite the Afghans or anybody else to come to our assistance but I am anxious for them not to come to our assistance. I am quite confident of India's ability to settle with the Government without extraneous help. Moreover I am interested in demonstrating the perfect possibility of attaining our end only by non-violent means.*

This reply to Mr. Andrews is one of the most remarkable and damaging confessions, extracted from you by the force of circumstances, the other being your confession as regards the Raykot fiasco. This damaging evidence, which was purposely concealed from the public by your lieutenants, lest it should deprive you of the halo of saintliness, proved firstly, that your article on Afghan Bogey was an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border and thus you had become a direct party to violence. When I made the same charge you were bold to deny it. This proves your deceitfulness, hypocrisy and unscrupulousness which are all according to your opinion the attributes of Satan. Secondly, under the pretence of satisfying a friend you apologised to the Government in an under-hand manner. Tendering an apology is generally regarded as an act of cowardice. But tendering an apology in secret leaving your friends in lurch is an act of gross betrayal. In the heated atmosphere of Allahabad you were loudly proclaiming your solidarity with the Ali Brothers in their conspiracies with the Amir. And immediately afterwards from the cool heights of Simla you were informing all those whom it might concern that not only you did not want to invite the Afghans but you were anxious for them not to come to your assistance. This was certainly a breach of faith with the Ali Brothers. However I must admit that you were sure of carrying the Ali Brothers with you in your climb down. For secret messages

from Kabul were reaching Maulana Mahomed Ali, informing him that his aggressive pan-Islamist policy was not likely to find much favour with those who were looking after the national interests of Afghanistan. In his Congress Presidential Address at Cocanada Maulana Mahomed Ali has revealed, "I have heard that my Madras speech of 1921 had not found much favour even in Afghanistan." The Viceroy also was equally well informed and determined to humiliate the conspirators once for all. The way in which he terrified the Ali Brothers and you also and got that apology is revealed by Pandit Motilal Neharu's letter to you, anonymously published in 'Young India' of 15-6-1921. He says,

"The case, which more forcibly than any other comes to my mind at the moment, is that of Hamid Ahamad, who has recently been sentenced at Allahabad to transportation for life and forfeiture of property. Is there any reason why this man should not be saved? I find, Maulana Mahomed Ali pays him a high tribute in his Bombay Speech of the 30th of May 1921. What consolation this tribute will bring to Hamid Ahamad from a man *similarly situated* who has saved himself by an apology and an undertaking, I cannot say."

I suspect, that the case of Hamid Ahamad who had received the thundering sentence of transportation for life and forfeiture of property had made an equally strong impression on you and your associates and therefore you tendered an undignified apology to Lord Reading. I know, that you court imprisonment often enough, but you prefer to come out of the gaol as soon as you can. It is hardly necessary to explain that I am referring to your notorious fasts of 1933.

When you had suffered a serious diminution of your prestige by your underhand dealings with the Government, you induced the Government to issue an agreed statement of facts relating to the Ali Brothers' apology. While commenting on that statement you had tried to impress on your credulous readers,

"It makes it clear that the apology, as I have called the statement of regrets, initiated with me, and that it was conceived before I ever knew of the impending prosecution for the speeches that were shown to me and that it was neither suggested nor made for fear of the prosecution of the Brothers, certainly not to avoid imprisonment."

The impression conveyed by this sentence is utterly false. The prosecution of the Ali Brothers was decided upon by the Government on the 6th of May. You referred to their impending prosecution in your speech at the Allahabad District Conference on the 10th of May and immediately afterwards you went to Simla to meet Lord Reading. In spite of these proven facts, you have the temerity to suggest that the apology initiated with you before you ever knew of their impending prosecution. Saints and Mahatmas have a most inconvenient past, it seems. The poet Bhavabhuti has already advised वृद्धान्ते न विचारणीयचरितः (one should not look too closely into the lives of old men.)

That the apology you tendered, was imposed upon you by the Government against your will is evident from your subsequent actions. In spite of that ignominious apology, you continued your intrigues with the Afghan Government. The evidence supporting the above assertion is contained in the resolutions of the All India Congress Committee and the Working Committee in 1921. In Nagpur Session of the Muslim League, you had moved a resolution advising the Amir not to sign a treaty with the British Government, but you could not move a similar resolution in Nagpur Congress for fear of opposition by Malaviya and others. In the beginning of April, Mahomed Ali began to canvass public opinion in favour of Afghan invasion and pressed the Congress to pass a resolution on lines similar to those of the Muslim League Resolution. On the 26th of April a meeting of the Bombay Muslims was held under the auspices of the

Central Khilafat Committee, and it passed the following resolution.

"In view of the fact that the destiny of the people of India is inevitably linked with that of the neighbouring Asiatic Nations and powers, this public meeting of the Mussalmans of Bombay request the All India Congress Committee to promote feelings of amity and concord with neighbouring states, and with a view to establish mutual goodwill and sympathy, to formulate a clear and definite foreign policy for India."

Thereupon the All India Congress Committee resolved to carry out the orders of their masters and asked the Working Committee to frame a statement on Indian foreign policy. The Working Committee on its part entrusted the matter to you. Your draft was so injurious to the national interests that even the subservient Working Committee advised you to recast the original draft. That you may not deny this fact, I quote the resolution of the Working Committee, passed in the first week of September at Calcutta.

"That the note on foreign policy prepared and placed before the meeting by Mahatma Gandhi be recast in the light of the discussion by the members and be circulated among the members of the Working Committee and submitted for the approval at the next meeting of the Working Committee."

We will be obliged if you will be good enough to make public your original draft which was rejected by the Working Committee. Even the amended resolution which was passed at Bombay on the 5th of October, makes a very painful reading, as the following sentences will show:—

"India as a self-governing country can have nothing to fear from the neighbouring States or any State as her people have no designs upon any of them and hence no intention of establishing any trade relations hostile to or not desired by such States.

"The Committee wishes also to assure the Mussalman States that when India attains self-government her foreign policy will naturally be always guided so as to respect the religious obligations imposed upon Mussalmans by Islam."

The first sentence enunciates a most stupid and ridiculous proposition. As a goat has no designs on a tiger, she can have nothing to fear from that non-violent animal! The special reference to the trade relations shows the hidden hand of the Afghan foreign minister Tarzi, behind it. The Government of India had disallowed the transit of arms through India to Afghanistan and the Afghan Government was very anxious to have this embargo removed and hence the inclusion of the above in your statement on foreign policy. Your 'holy' support enabled them to have the restrictions removed. Secondly, you assured the Muslim States that after having attained self-government, Indian Foreign policy will naturally be always guided so as to respect the religious obligations imposed upon Mussalmans by Islam. What these religious obligations amount to, can be seen from the following quotation—

“According to the Quoranic Law there cannot be peace between a Mahomedan King and his neighbouring infidel states. The latter are Dar-ul-Harb or legitimate seats of war, and it is the Muslim king's duty to slay and plunder in them, till they accept the true faith and become Dar-ul-Islam, after which they will become entitled to his protection.”

(Sarkar's 'Shivaji' pp. 479-480)

This clearly means that India is either to be ruled by Muslims or is to become a legitimate seat of war for the Afghans. This shows that there can be no peace between infidel India and Afghanistan, your previous assurances notwithstanding. Another implication of Islamic religious obligations is that Indian Muslim soldiers are not to fight against the invading Muslim armies. This fact is well illustrated by the recent demand by Mr. Jinnah that Indian Muslim soldiers should not be used against Muslim nations. Hence your assurance to observe Islamic obligations means nothing but consent to the establishment of Muslim Raj in India.

Your partisans complain that I read too much between your lines. To set their doubts at rest I quote an evidence from no less an authority than Hakim Ajmal Khan, the simultaneous President of the Congress and the Khilafat Conference at Ahmedabad. In his presidential address to the Khilafat Conference he blurted out, in your presence,

“India on the one side and the Asia Minor on the other are but two extreme links in a chain of future Islamic Federation, which are gradually but surely joining together all intermediate States in one great system.”

(I. A. R. 1922 p. 447)

This statement is very important as it was made in your presence and unless it is explicitly denied I presume, with your consent. In the same speech the Hakim disclosed the connection between the non-co-operation movement and the non-conclusion of the Afghan Treaty. While discussing the Anglo-Afghan Treaty, he remarked,

“All that could possibly be said against the treaty was that it was perhaps not well-timed and that the Indian people would have approved a further postponement.”

Of course it was not well-timed as the treaty was signed on the very date on which your mass civil disobedience was about to commence at Bardoli, and hence it had to be postponed. That the ratification of the Anglo-Afghan Treaty on February 6th and the final abandonment of mass civil disobedience on February 11th was not a mere coincidence is proved from the above statement of your trusted lieutenant Hakim Ajmal Khan.

The inter-relation between the Khilafat movement and the Amir of Afghanistan was clearly exposed by an independent Englishman, Col. J. C. Wedgwood in his book ‘The Future of the Indo-British Commonwealth’ :—

“That the Amir should become the Khalifa is the wish of every raging Muslim in India. He is on their borders, almost in hand, a permanent threat to British India. Every

conqueror save one has come down from the Afghan passes. India as a whole does not want what the Muslims want. The leaders of Indian thought and politics desire democracy and fear ruler, whether, Ranjeet Singh from the Punjab or an Amir from Kabul. The temporal power of a religion seems to them as wrong as it does to us. As education spreads India may convert the Muslim or the Muslim may convert India. It is quite certain that after what has passed British cannot convert the Indian Muslim from his rage, either by force or fraud or kindness, that conversion must be left to time and India."

No one could have depicted more forcibly the inherent antagonism between genuine (Hindu) nationalism and Muslim fanaticism. Yet you succumbed to the Muslim fanaticism to the detriment of the Hindu Nation.

In fairness to you I must state that you had an idea that the Government would come to terms with the people under the threat of Afghan invasion.

"Mr. Pal suggests that if the Amir invades and if we do not aid the government there can only be a revolution. I venture to suggest another alternative. If India as a non-co-operating India does not assist, the government will make terms with the people. I do not consider the British people to be so utterly devoid of commonsense or resourcefulness as to leave India rather than come to terms with her and heal the Khilafat and the Punjab wounds."

I do not think that this attitude of yours is morally any better, than that of a traitor. This attitude of yours is criticised by the 'Citizen' of Madras as follows:—

"If the Afghans invade he (Gandhi) says the British government rather than run the risk of defeat may come to terms with India which for this purpose must not co-operate with them. This is worse than a direct invitation to the Amir to invade India. That at least has the saving grace of openness, while the other attitude is characterised by artifice and cowardice which we know Mr. Gandhi to abhor. The episode shows the length to which one will be driven if one is weak enough to think that a friend must be supported at all costs whatever may be the indiscretions of which the latter may be guilty. We admire Mr. Gandhi's chivalry but deplore his political degeneracy."

You had already stated that under the threat of Afghan invasion you would compel the British Government to come to terms with you. And hence all your activities were directed to force the Government to listen to you. In fact your programme was to play a double role. Hence Swami Shraddhanand had told you in a straightforward and blunt manner that your pronouncements were always dubious. Before you were sure of the Afghans you were not prepared to lose your British masters, and hence your opposition to the creed of independence.

At one time you were ready to prostitute belief in God in order to oppose the idea of independence.

“But assuming that Great Britain alters her attitude, as I know she will when India is strong, it will be religiously unlawful for us to insist on independence. For it will be vindictive and petulant. It would amount to a denial of God for the refusal will then be based upon the assumption that the British people are not capable of response to the God in man; such a position is untenable for both a believing Mussalman and a believing Hindu.”

In spite of this fanatical opposition to independence you acquiesced in the passing of the resolution of Independence at Madras. If you had opposed that resolution it would not have been passed as was the case in former years. Will you kindly reveal to us the reasons that prompted your acquiescence? Our information is that this change of views was inspired by King Amanullah. Sardar Iqbal Ali Shah, in his ‘Tragedy of Amanullah’ while describing his visit to Bombay in 1927 says,

“And in Bombay, whilst still the guest of British administration, Amanullah made a diplomatic blunder. A big public function was organised in his honour in that city; all the dignitaries were present, including the British Governor, when he urged upon the Indians the necessity of severing their connections with England. That public speech, of course, created a very bad impression for its indelicacy, inasmuch

as it was tantamount to interfering in the domestic politics of a foreign and friendly country.’”

This information is confirmed by Mr. D. G. Upson, who wrote in the ‘Pioneer,’

“As to India the (Afghan) king proceeded to assure me that he and his people had every sympathy with the national aspirations of Indians. He spoke of a league of Eastern Nations as a greatly cherished project.”

I can make a guess as to the motives of Amanullah in influencing Congress leaders to adopt the Independence Resolution. The well-informed anonymous Muslim author of the, ‘Confederacy of India’ has revealed that the attitude of Amanullah’s Government towards the grant of reforms to India was according to his information hostile. As you had already become a tool in the hands of Amanullah, you played his game of thwarting the Indian Reforms, by gradually favouring the party which insisted on the severance of the connection with the British Empire. You might pretend that the idealism of Jawaharlal was responsible for the Independence Resolution and Afghan influence had nothing to do with it. It is well-known that Jawaharlal was expelled from Mussooree for plotting with the Afghan foreign minister. And as to his devotion to independence of which we hear so much now-a-days, you will find that it is merely superficial, by a reference to the issues of ‘Young India’ of January 1922. At the Ahmedabad Congress, Maulana Hasarat Mohani while moving his resolution on changing the Congress creed to independence had said that Jawaharlal Nehru was of the same opinion, and would have supported his resolution, had he not then been in jail. When this news reached Pandit Jawaharlal, he wrote a letter to his paper ‘Independent’ indignantly repudiating the creed of independence and expressing disapproval of the conduct of those who supported the resolution. The text of this letter was published also

in 'Young India.' If in spite of such dubious past Jawaharlal sponsored and you did not oppose the Independence Resolution at Madras Congress, then this change of views must be attributed to the influence exercised over both of you by Amir Amanullah. That Amanullah was and is even now keenly interested in the Indian Independence Movement is obvious from the following interview he gave to Chamanlal.

"When I presented him a copy of my recent book the 'Vanishing Empire' he felt jubilant over the prospect of India attaining complete freedom in the near future, and added that his greatest ambition in life besides serving his country was to see India free. He lost his throne, said he because of his love of India. He did not care for his throne but he still wanted to see Afghanistan in the rank of powerful nations and see India a free Country."

It is clear that the ex-Amir wishes Afghanistan to be powerful and India only to be free. He wishes to see India free from British protection and helpless and dependent on powerful Afghanistan.

Amanullah's friends in India also were anxious to see Afghanistan powerful and therefore were preaching the surrender of certain Indian provinces to Afghanistan. Mr. Mahomed Ali in his speech at the Muslim League Conference in 1924 said,

"If I were to have my own way I would not support the resolution but move an amendment that those parts of the frontier provinces which did not by right belong to India but were really a part of the territories of the people across the Indian border which lay on the other side of the Indus should be given back to those people" (applause)

This speech was made in your presence and with your silent support. The resolution on Hindu-Muslim unity which was passed at the Madras Congress in 1927 meant also the same thing, as is proved by the following statement of Mrs. Sarojini Nayudu, made while moving the resolution.

"They (Muslim leaders) have further said, 'give us if you will by such distribution of provinces on the lines of

your Congress distribution which will make among other provinces Sind a separate province, that will give to Baluchistan and the North West Frontier Province, with those which Amanullah His Afghan Majesty rules, the opportunity to develop, brotherhood and freedom.”

These words of the Muslim leaders reveal their desire to give these provinces an opportunity to secede from India and join Afghanistan.

The intentions of the Muslim leaders are given expression through Mrs. Nayudu's speeches as also Pandit Jawaharlal's. The following statement of Dr. B. S. Moonje confirms Jawaharlal's subservience to Muslim dictates. The occasion for this statement was Jawaharlal's venomous attack on the Hindu Mahasabha in an address to the students of the Hindu University.

“Young Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his juvenile exuberance of communism has condemned the Hindu Mahasabha but if the sequence of events that happened immediately preceding his attack is to be borne in mind, it appears that it is a command performance at the dictation of the big brother Maulana Shaukat Ali and is indicative of his defeatist mentality in respect of the Muslims. On the eve of his departure from Bombay to attend the Muslim Leaders Conference at Lucknow Mr. Shaukat Ali had announced to the press in respect of Bhai Paramanand's propaganda against the communal award that he does not propose to enter into a wordy warfare with the Mahasabha, but leaves the task of checkmating its activities to congressmen and the nationalist Hindus. I congratulate Pandit Jawaharlal for having faithfully responded to that dictation. In his fondness for his Persian culture, Pandit Jawaharlal may take pride in forsaking his forefather's religion for his new love of communism but he must understand that there is a limit to the patience of even the proverbially mild and docile Hindu who is still capable of rising in defence of his world-old religion and culture. The wonder however is that Pandit Malaviya did not pull his ears more briskly.”

Apropos of the Muslim Leaders Conference at Lucknow referred to above, I wish to bring to your notice an important statement of Mr. Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, an ex-Minister in the

Pant Cabinet. In an open letter to Dr. Ansari Mr. Kidwai has stated,

"While you were in Europe there was convened at Lucknow a conference of representatives of the different Muslim organisations. We (All India Muslim Nationalist Party) were represented in this conference by our leaders, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Dr. Syed Mahmud, and Chaudhari Khaliquzzaman. And by the time the Conference came to an end we had agreed to almost everything to oppose which the All India Muslim Nationalist Party had come into existence. For the last few months I have been thinking of resigning the office of the General Secretaryship of the party. You know how reluctant I was to give consent to my election for the post. This reluctance was due not to any lack of enthusiasm in me for the 'Nationalism' but to the fear that, we would not live up to our ideals."

Since that time Khaliquzzaman has become a prominent leader of the Muslim League. Dr. Syed Mahmud has played an important part with Asaf Ali and Ansari in securing the virtual ratification of the communal award by the Congress. As to the great Maulana, he has secured the presidentship of the Congress with your active help and is exploiting the Congress platform to preach that the Muslims are a nation by themselves and agreeably surprising the Muslim Leaguers. I am quoting the following from the 'Times of India,' for your edification.

"Asked about Maulana Azad's remarks regarding the minorities Sir Ali M. K. Dehlavi observed, 'There I must confess I was most agreeably surprised and I am glad to discover that our lost brother the great Maulana is, after all, a Muslim at heart and politically not only that but a pan-Islamist. He has made an authoritative admission, as the duly elected and accredited president of the Congress that the Muslims in India are a nation and not a minority.'"

The logical conclusion of this idea is that the Muslims are the only nation in India and all the others are only communities. The Maulana has already told us at Ramgadh,

"The Muslims in India number between 80 and 90 millions."

The same type of social or racial divisions, which affect other communities do not divide them. The powerful bonds of Islamic brotherhood and equality have protected them to a large extent from the weakness that flows from social divisions."

Eminent Muslim leaders have often declared that

"In default of British control, resigned in weariness or disgust, Indian unity could only be revived and sustained by the Muslims, recruited as they would be by their kinsmen and coreligionists from the regions beyond the North West Frontier."

For this purpose Muslim congressmen are demanding that a large number of tribal people should be recruited to the Indian Army. The Afridi leader Mahomad Jaman Khan told Sir Akbar Hyderi,

"You are the intelligent link between the tribes on the Frontier and the Nizam's State. It is my urgent desire that the roads connecting the frontier to the Hyderabad should be broad and straight."

While all these nefarious intrigues are going on, the lame Maulana is sitting on your shoulders and leading you blindfold to the precipice of anarchy. I am informed that recently you have met an even greater nationalist than the intriguing Maulana to lead you, namely, Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung, the *ame damnè* of His Exalted Highness to whom you are offering to make the Emperor of India. You, the son of a minister in a petty State in Gujarat could not have found a better job than this in the last days of your life. I congratulate you on your choice.

I beg to remain,
the Emperor-maker's most humble servant,

A. J. Karandikar

the entire mind of political India. The other sphere, where the word 'nationalism' has been applied with some force, is the economic sphere. Here too, it is very vague and incomplete. In the cultural sphere, however, it remains unapplied.

CRITERION OF A NATION

In the West, the only criterion of a nation is its language. In India, however, there are factors which have come into the foreground and have thrown language into the background. In India, the Hindu-Muslim question stands in the way of development of pure nationalism.

It is a very sad thing that Hindus, who belong to this country in every sense of the word, have been completely de-Hinduised in their mental out-look, so much so that absolutely anti-Hindu and anti-national ideals are being accepted and given the name of nationalism.

This means suicide for the Hindus. In the history of the world there is no nation and no religion which has denounced suicide in such strong terms as the Hindus, and still they are committing suicide. The responsibility for this great national crime lies on the leaders and not on the masses.

CONVERTS OF THE SWORD

Instead of nationalising the Muslims as is happening in Persia and Turkey by definitely de-Arabizing them, here the emphasis is in the wrong direction.

The Muslims of India believe in pan-Islam which to them means the supremacy of Arabia; and the Hindus submit to it in the most shameless fashion. Let it be made known that the political and cultural subjugation of India started a thousand years ago when the Muslim Barbarians came, looted and subjugated northern parts of India which were

dis-united among themselves. The Hindus have shown little political wisdom during all these one thousand years. All sorts of cruelties have been perpetrated by these wild barbarians from the North-West, and among them there was one which would do discredit to any religion of the world.

The poor, the helpless, the lowly, were arraigned before the sword to be beheaded unless they accepted the religion of the executioner.

LOVE IS JEALOUS

This is the process which has created the situation, which confronts the political India of today. These converts of the sword are bound by ties of faithful regard and piety to countries to the north-west and west of India but not to India itself. This situation, our political leaders in India, are not prepared to face. Such state of affairs must not be allowed to exist and continue if India has to develop as one nation.

Love is jealous, if you love India truly you cannot love another land and if you love another land you cannot love India. We must be undaunted and tell all residents of India that the country which has given birth to them, the country which gives them shelter, demands their whole-hearted faith and love, and does not allow them to look upon other countries in any other way than as foreign countries.

If the Afghans invade India today it is the duty of every Indian to fight them, to crush them and if among us there exist people who would go and make a common cause with the Afghans the world has only one name for them and we must not be afraid of using that word. That word is 'Traitor' and there is only one punishment for a traitor, that is death. So the traitors from India must die out or they must be converted to the love of their motherland.

Those who differ from us, howsoever great they may be, they have not yet imbibed the true spirit of nationalism. Nationalism is a constructive thing, but to construct it must destroy whatever comes in the way of construction.

THE QUESTION OF LANGUAGE

Imagine an old, intelligent, experienced nation like the Hindus who are being suppressed even in such simple things as language. If for the time being we have not become true nationalists and have not been able to make every resident of India a true nationalist, the reason is that Hindus are not allowing themselves to continue as nationalists. We say with great emphasis that we shall not submit to British Imperialism, but we also ought to say that we shall shake off all the traces of our slavery to the Mughals who are now dead and gone, and who have been a shame to our national history.

In the Punjab and many other provinces in India, Urdu is being used as the language of schools and Law Courts and administration in general. It has been argued that Urdu and Hindi must be combined to make one language which has now been given the name Hindustani. Nobody knows what the process of this combination is. Nobody knows how much Hindi in Hindustani there should be and how much Urdu. This percentage has never been fixed definitely. It is impossible to do so. About the script it is said that any one may use any script, either Devanagari or Persian. It must be noted clearly that other scripts of India like Bengali and Gujarati cannot be used for this purpose. It is absurd.

STRANGERS IN OUR OWN LAND

Self-respect, self-determination, self-development and freedom, these are words which ultimately have to be used not in restricted part of our political life but on a very grand scale. Why should the Indian language be written in a

foreign script? Why should we, who are proud of being Indian nationalists, use a Persian script? Will that not mean a permanent shame and an infamy? Foreign alphabets are used only by barbarians who possess no alphabet of their own. Shall we give this evidence to the posterity that we had no script of our own to write with? Is it not a sad spectacle?

Hindus, if you are not strong enough to convert the Mohammadens of this country to Indianism, why should you degrade yourself and be Persianised and Arabized yourself?

As Indian nationalists, it is our duty to see that every resident of this land is proud of India and he should not be a party to India's slavery, in any sphere to any country. We must hang our heads in shame whenever young boys sing songs of the beauties of the Persian flowers, Persian birds, Persian heroes and know nothing of their own land. We are being made strangers in our own land. This process must be put an end to.

We must be strong enough at least to ordain for ourselves that no child of ours will be allowed to be Persianised or Arabized.

Let the Hindu child remain a pure Indian, so that in the making of our nation in the near future it should stand as the backbone of the nation.

—'Maharatta' 26-4-40

INTRIGUES WITH HYDERABAD

"Peace in Waziristan can be restored if we set about improving the economic condition of those people," declares Mr. Abdul Qaiyum, M.L.A. (Central) in the course of a press-statement.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum suggests that a large number of Tribal people should be recruited to the Indian army. He says, "if twenty thousand tribesmen are serving in our army they will not only be a source of a strength to us but we will have no danger of raids or kidnappings from their relatives at home. Surely they are better fighters than even the Gurkhas. I hope the Government of India will revise their policy regarding the tribes and a peaceful time will soon come."

—'Free Press Journal' 3-2-40



Sir Akbar Hyderi, President of the Nizam's Executive Council, had been on a tour to the North West Frontier Province of India. His tour to the Frontier as the representative of the Nizam, sent on his behalf to unveil the statue associating the hostel of the Islamia College, Peshawar, with the Nizam's name, was in every sense a pompous demonstration organised by the Muslim Communalists.

A stream of deputations from various organisations greeted Sir Akbar at Amritsar and Lahore. At the Peshawar Station the reception was unique both in its representative character and its members.

On the 11th Sir Akbar went to lunch with Nawab Saadullah Khan, 25 miles away from Peshawar, when Modin and tribesmen in thousands greeted him at various stages of the journey by road.

The function at the Islamia College saw the climax of the enthusiasm of the Moulavis and Muslim Communalists. The buildings and the roads were decorated with ancient Muslim architecture and green flags.

Sir Akbar Hyderi said in his speech, "Though Hyderabad is two thousand miles away from this place, yet we are very near and we are tied down by a common bond. Had not our relations been so mutually connected I would not have taken the trouble to traverse such a long distance. I sincerely hope to embrace you all as my kiths and kins only because I think that we are all connected by a sacred tie. The students of the Islamia College have to shoulder heavy responsibilities and I hope that they shall not shirk from that responsibility. You are the missionaries who are to preach and propagate Islam to the various tribes in India." He in the end referred to the dual role of the Frontier Muslims as the connecting link between the Muslims of India and the Muslim peoples across its frontiers and as the custodians of India's gate-way, the guardians of its inviolability.

Then followed a garden party where more than hundred and fifty prominent personalities were present. Sir Akbar Hyderi appreciated the Cosmopolitan spirit that could be seen owing to the presence of the persons following different faiths.

On the third day Sir Akbar visited the Khyber Pass with the Political Agent and went as far as the frontiers of India at Landi Khana, meeting with a warm welcome at different stages from the Afridi Khasadars and tribesmen.

He was given a guard of honour at Tarud Fort. He said his prayers at the famous mosques on the Frontier. He visited a gun factory and appreciated the demonstration of the firings of the crude guns.

The leader of the Afridi tribes, Mahomed Jamman Khan welcomed Sir Hyderi and they embraced each other. The leader said, "you are the intelligent link between the tribes on the Frontier and the Nizam's State. It is my urgent desire that the roads connecting the Frontier to the Hyderabad should be broad and straight. Our situation does not allow us to follow a definite policy. Yet I promise on behalf of my tribesmen to the Nizam that we are always at the service of His Exalted Highness." While giving a reply to this Sir Akbar said, "there is not a word that can express the joy that I feel when I see such active enthusiasts guarding the gate-way of India."

Before visiting Kohat, Sir Hyderi had a prolonged secret talk with the Moulavis at Peshawar in Mahabatkhan Mosque.

Similar scenes of enthusiasm were witnessed on the way to and at Kohat the following day. On the way back, streams of deputationists poured in at the railway stations and emphasised the close connection between the Muslims of the Punjab and the Nizam's State.

—'Maharatta' 22-3-40



Spectacular events in Indian politics have kept the visit of the Premier of the Nizam State to the Indo-Afghan frontier unnoticed. The mystery behind the visit remains concealed. People are talking that the Muslims of India, under the leadership of the Muslim League, are planning the establishment of the Muslim rule over the whole of India by making the Nizam its king. Sometime back Mr. Jinnah

paid a visit to the Nizam, talked with him for two hours about the Indian political problem, and refused to disclose the subject matter of their talk to the press. And now comes the bomb-shell in the form of the Nizam's Premier's visit to the Indo-Afghan border to visit India's gate-way in the North—the gate-way which joins the Muslim majority provinces in India with the Muslim States of North and North-West. We are informed by the Associated Press that, "Nawab Mahomed Jamman, Head of the Afridi tribe, is reported to have said that the presence of the Nizam's Premier in their midst gave them the greatest pleasure and he placed the entire resources and services of the Afridi tribe at the disposal of the Nizam and (further) said that with its acceptance the tribal area would be joined to the premier Muslim State in more than one country." These words are as clear as day-light. The Muslims seem to be thinking of stepping into the shoes of the weakening Britishers, establish Muslim raj in India, making the Nizam its Sultan, and joining it to Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey which have agreed to render mutual support. These seem to be the writings on the wall. Will Government of India and the Hindus take note of this?

—'Mahratta' 22-3-40



Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung, President of the All-India States Muslim League, in a recent speech commented on Mahatma Gandhi's article on 'Hyderabad' published in the 'Harijan'.

The Nawab said that the article contained the talk given by Gandhiji to the speaker on his way back from Delhi, and thought that if the demand to restore the territories was just as admitted by Mahatma Gandhi "it is yet to be

enquired of him whether equity is a different variety from justice."

Proceeding the Nawab said, "As to the choice of the people of the Ceded areas they were not consulted when the territories were taken away from Hyderabad. Moreover Mahatma Gandhi himself stated in his article that he preferred anarchy to foreign rule.

"Why should he not then advise the people of these territories which we demand back to agitate to return to an orderly Indian rule? The other questions are domestic." The speaker endorsed Mahatma Gandhi that the king is a servant of the people but he is not in the Gandhian term a helpless monarch or a mere puppet at the beck and call of the legislature.

The Islamic conception is that of a full-fledged and all-powerful Khalif who derives divine power from the people.

—'Mahratta' 29-11-40



GANDHIJI on HYDERABAD

"What do you say to the right of Hyderabad to the territories that have been taken away by the English under some pretext or other, e. g. Berar, Ceded Districts, Kamatak etc.?"

This question demands an answer. So far been taken away by the English, the right is of the English. If I am asked as a matter of only say that the people of the respective part asked to make their choice. That is the only way.

But I suggest that all such discussion is India, the geographical unit, gets independence. Some day, it means that every component part

dependence. If independence is won non-violently, all the component parts will be voluntarily interdependent working in perfect harmony under a representative central authority which will derive its sanction from the confidence reposed in it by the component parts. If independence is taken by force of arms, then the strongest power will hold sway over all India. And this may be Hyderabad for aught I know. All the big and the petty States will be free willynilly from the British yoke. They will each fight for their existence and succumb to the strongest who will be the Emperor of India. This presupposes unarmed millions lying prostrate at the feet of the combination of armed States. Many other things are, however, conceivable. The Indian part of the British army will probably have consciousness of strength and an independent existence. There may be Muslim arms, Sikh arms, Gurkha arms, Rajput arms and what not. They may fight among themselves, or, having allied themselves to some nationalist party, may present a united front to the Princes. There may also be the descent upon India of the warring tribes from the Frontier to share the spoils or the sovereignty itself.

The Congress, if it still has anything of its nonviolence left in it, will die in the attempt to establish universal peace in India. It is not impossible that all the warring elements will find it profitable in more ways than one voluntarily to surrender themselves to the moral authority of a central power. This means universal suffrage exercised by a disciplined and politically intelligent electorate. It also means a decent and permanent burial to communal and other discord.

But this may not happen. The existing state of things does not warrant an optimistic outlook. But I am a man of faith. And to faith all things are possible. But supposing

the worst happens and there is anarchy in the land, if there is God upon earth as He is in heaven, then you may depend upon it that I shall not live to make any choice. I shall die in the anarchic flame whilst I am vainly attempting to still it with my tiny, shaky hands. But if you ask me in advance whether I would face anarchy in preference to foreign orderly rule, either British or any other, I would unhesitatingly plump for anarchy, say, the rule of the Nizam supported by Chiefs become feudatory to him or supported by the border Muslim tribes. In my estimation it will be cent per cent domestic. It will be home rule though far, far from self-rule or swa-raj (स्व-राज). But you must let me repeat that, while I can write thus academically, if the reality faces me, my choice will be death or the rule of the people by the people for the people. This means the rule of unadulterated non-violence. So you see my non-violence is made not of cotton wool but of a metal much harder than steel and yet softer than cotton wool. You can compare it only with itself.

You will naturally then ask what place have the Princes in my scheme of things. Such a question should not arise if you had fully realized the implications of non-violence. For, the Princes obeying the moral authority of a central body not sustained by arms will find an honourable place as servants of the people. No one will have any rights but what are inherent in a willing performance of one's duties. Thus H. E. H. the Nizam will then be the chosen servant of people. Only, then, his people will not be merely those confined willynilly within his present borders but may be all India. You must not dismiss this as a utopian scheme. I claim to be a practical man. If the Congress proves true to its policy, what may seem today to be an airy nothing, may tomorrow become an agreeable reality. In my scheme

there is no waste of either human talent or creative effort. Let me quote here my cable to H. G. Wells in reply to his on the Rights of Man :

“ Received your cable. Have carefully read your five articles. You will permit me to say, you are on the wrong track. I feel sure that I can draw up a better charter of rights than you have drawn up. But what good will it be? Who will become its guardian? If you mean propaganda or popular education, you have begun at the wrong end. I suggest the right way. Begin with a charter of Duties of Man, and I promise the rights will follow as spring follows winter. I write from experience. As a young man I began life by seeking to assert my rights, and I soon discovered I had none—not even over my wife. So I began by discovering and performing my duty by my wife, my children, friends, companions and society, and I find today that I have greater rights, perhaps, than any living man I know. If this is too tall a claim, then I say I do not know anyone who possesses greater rights than I. ”

Sevagram, 8-10-40

—‘Harijan’ 13-10-40.



Barr. SAVARKAR on HYDERABAD

Under the caption ‘ Hyderabad ’ Gandhiji has recently written an article in the ‘ Harijan ’ dated the 13th October 1940, purported to be a reply to a real or fancied correspondent who wanted to know what Gandhiji thought of the “ Right of Hyderabad to the Territories of Berar, Ceded Districts, Karnatak, etc., which had been taken away by the British under some pretext or the other. ”

It is not any special merit which attaches to this article but it is the mischievous effect, it is sure to produce on the

Moslem public mind by inciting them to press on the Pakistan movement with added zeal that the article must be brought to the notice of the Hindu public and condemned forthwith.

From the trend of the article, it is clear that the article is deliberately meant by Gandhiji to goad the Muslims on to continue the Pakistan movement with greater confidence in as much as he extends in the course of the article a covert support and holds before the eyes of the Muslim fanaticism an assurance that if but the Muslims dare to strike in time to establish a Moslem Empire in India, the move is very likely to succeed and could be in a way morally and politically justified.

We have it on the evidence of no less reliable an authority than Swami Shraddhanandji himself that after the last Anglo-Afghan War of 1919, Gandhiji abetted the treacherous move on the part of the Moslem leaders to invite the Amir Amanullah of Afghanistan to invade India again. Mr. A. J. Karandikar has recently written a series of articles in the 'Kesari' and the 'Maharatta' quoting chapter and verse, and proved it to the hilt that the charge was true.

Even recently time and again Gandhiji and his Congressite henchmen have stated it covertly and overtly that if the Moslems are bent upon cutting India piecemeal and convert parts of it into purely Moslem Raj, no power could stop them from doing so and these Congressite patriots would not hesitate to subject themselves to this would—be Pakistan as that also would be an Indian Rule.

If we take into consideration, in addition to this, the contact Gandhiji has been trying to establish with the Frontier Tribes for several years by sending out his trusted emissaries like Miraben, Perinben, Bhulabhai, Asafbhai and a number of other Bens and Bhais to woo the Pathans and plead their

cause that it is the economic and moral starvation alone which has compelled these poor Frontier Tribes, whom Gandhiji styles as 'God-fearing', to take to such 'legitimate' means of securing relief as looting, kidnapping, abducting, forcibly converting and murdering the Hindu men and women in the Frontier districts,—when we take into consideration all these activities, past and present, of Gandhist group and then read this article written by Gandhiji, no shred of doubt could be left in the mind of any clear-sighted Hindu reader as to the fact that Gandhi and his Congressite Hindu followers are about to play once again the same mischief; they would not hesitate to help the Moslem in the treacherous plot of Pakistan which they are already hatching to re-establish Moslem suzerainty in India, either by compelling the Hindus to acquiesce in a constitution after the Pakistan model under British pressure or by resorting to an armed revolution in case the British are perchance compelled by a crushing defeat in the World War to leave India and no new invader steps in.

If a correspondent has really asked Gandhiji what he thought about the 'Right' of Hyderabad to the restitution of the Ceded territories and believed that if but the equity of the case is certified under the sign and seal of the Shegaon tribunal the British Government would forthwith restore the territories to the Nizam, he must be a simpleton indeed. It is steel and gun-powder that decide the restitution of Kingdoms! But in spite of it all, Gandhiji seriously goes on arguing the silly question as seriously as it was asked and delivers his judgment to the effect, "So far as the territories have been taken away by the English, the right accrues against the English."

Now, making allowance for the fact that Gandhiji knows as little of Indian History as of Hebrew, he should have

known at least this much about the case, he so seriously argues that the Ceded territories were ceded by the Nizam to the English in return of the protection which the English offered him against the conquering Mahratta forces.

The Mahrattas had well-nigh finished the Nizam at Kharda and he knew that he would soon be standing as a prisoner at the gate of the Peshwas in Poona, where his Vazir was already undergoing the same fate, if he did not call in the English to protect him. The other territories were conquered by the English from the Nizam by the right of the sword.

But, if perchance Gandhiji refuses to recognise any right which is based on the conquest by sword as right at all, then instead of asking the English to restore the conquered and Ceded territories to the Nizam, Gandhiji must ask the Nizam to evacuate even the territories which he possesses at present for the simple reason that he usurped the whole Dominion from the Moghul Emperor who had appointed the Nizam as his Governor, by an armed revolt against his own Master.

Nay, if the right of the conquest by sword is out of court altogether then the first rightful owner who could be ascertained at present and to whom the whole territory, the Nizam possesses as well as the ceded districts etc., ought to be restored straight,—is the Maharaja of Vijayanagar! For, it was his ancestors who were the rightful owners of that Kingdom before the Moslem hoards “came with iron hands and from our Fathers snatched the Land.”

But leaving this question of “right” aside, Gandhiji proceeds, “If I am asked as a matter of equity, I can only state that the people of the respective parts, that is, Berar, Ceded Districts, Karnatak, etc., should be asked to make their

choice, that is the only equity I know." Now, no one can have any objection to this pleasant platitude but for the fact that it is resorted to as a subterfuge to shirk the risk of telling the whole truth. The real bone of contention in such a matter is bound to be, how to ascertain this choice of the people.

If Gandhiji was serious in holding up the democratic principle then instead of stopping short with this innocuous platitude he should have unequivocally stated that the people's choice must be determined by the majority vote. But he knew the fact that the majority, not only of the Ceded Districts but of even the Nizam State itself being Hindus, a free plebiscite was bound to call upon the Nizam to clear out of the State altogether and any clear statement on the part of Gandhiji holding up the right of the Hindu majority would have consequently angered the Moslems whom in the latter part of the article he wanted to please in particular.

That is why he stopped short of telling the truth. The fraternity of soothsayers through all ages, who swear that they tell nothing but truth has had always to resort to the subterfuge of telling half truths which are often worse than lies, whenever they want to avoid the risk of telling the real truth and yet save their reputation as truth-tellers.

Not satisfied with only answering the question asked by the correspondent regarding the right of the Nizam to have the ceded and other districts only, Gandhiji utilises the occasion to enter into a digression totally unconnected with the original question. After beating about the bush a great deal regarding the different possibilities of the future development of Indian political situation and after assuming a number of absurdities he comes to the conclusion that in case the British power is overthrown in India as the result of the war and in case no other non-Indian world-power steps immediately in the shoes of Britain to rule India which con-

sequently would be left in the throes of an internal anarchy, "the strongest power in the Land will hold sway over all India and this," Gandhiji avers, "may be Hyderabad for ought I know. All other big and petty chiefs will ultimately succumb to the strongest power of the Nizam who will be the Emperor of India."

But what will be the role of the Congress and Gandhiji himself under these circumstances? According to Gandhiji "the poor Congress if it is true to its creed of non-violence will die." Quite a sound view, that such a body devoted to such a creed can be blessed with no other fate! Even Gandhiji who says in the article, "I am a man of faith and to a man of faith nothing is impossible," admits that the Congress future is dark! "The existing state of things does not warrant any optimistic outlook."

But Gandhiji will not feel quite out of sorts even if the Congress dies and such an anarchy sets in.

For says he, "If you ask me in advance whether I would face anarchy to foreign orderly rule, either British or any other I would unhesitatingly plump for anarchy, say, the rule of the Nizam supported by the chiefs become feudatory to him or supported by the border Moslem tribes. 'Because' Gandhiji pointedly observes, "in my estimation such a rule,—under the Nizam raised to be the Emperor of India by reducing all other Hindu chiefs to his feudatories with the help of the border Moslem tribes—such a rule will be cent per cent domestic. It will be Home Rule."

....And after all this, Gandhiji adds "But this is all academic!!"

Geographically speaking, Aurangzeb too was born and bred in India. But was his Rule on that account looked upon by the Hindus as 'Home Rule'? No. It was on the contrary hated by them as a veritable hell and the rule of any Moslem

conqueror in future is bound to be similarly hated and overthrown by a new Shivaji or Bajirao or Ranjeet.

For this reason and also from the Ahimsak point of view, we sincerely request Gandhiji that it will be more in keeping with the principle of Ahimsa that he should not compromise with either logic or reason or circumstances or even with destiny. He himself has averred that he is a man of faith and to a man of faith like him nothing is impossible. Then why not once for all make it 'possible' to have the Ahimsak Empire itself firmly established in India at a stroke of 'faith'? Fortunately for us, there is Vinoba Bhave at hand who with the spinning-wheel is doubtless better fitted as the first Ahimsak Emperor of India than a Nizam bristling with spears, swords and guns from top to toe.

But the insurmountable difficulty which perhaps might have rendered Vinoba Bhave ineligible to this high honour seems to be the fact that after all he still continues to be Hindu and no Moslem can ever submit to a Hindu Rule. But as Hindus, at any rate, those of the non-violent school can but only feel honoured to tender subjection to a Moslem Rule and as it is impossible to find a Moslem dedicated to non-violence, Gandhiji was perhaps left with no choice but to offer the Crown to His Exalted Highness the Nizam.

Be that as it may we cannot refrain ourselves from offering a friendly suggestion to the Nizam that he should think twice before he allows His Exalted head to get swollen with any such quixotic ambition as the Pakistani Moslems and the few Hindus of masochistic Gandhi-breed may goad him on to indulge in.

Last time these very Gandhi-Azads along with the Khilafatists persuaded Amanullah the Amir to believe that he was the God-appointed heir—apparent to the Indian throne.

As Fate would have it, Batcha-i-Sakka, the son of a water-carrier finished him. This time the very ill-omened Ghandhist group joining hands with the Pakistani Moslems, is trying to goad on the poor Nizam to bid for the Crown of Indian Empire. May God save him from a similar coming fate !

Although Gandhiji being a man of 'faith' could afford to be unconscious in the course of his article that there is some such political factor in India as the Hindu people to be taken into account ; and although the Nizam and the Frontier tribes are on his brain as the only living forces in India, yet the Nizam at least must be knowing, at any rate after the Hindu Civil Resistance Movement of last year that the Hindu Sanghatan Movement constitutes a second and a challenging factor in Indian politics today and is growing daily from strength to strength.

If such an anarchy as Gandhiji takes for granted in his article, does ever set in, leaving Hindus and the Moslems face to face in India, there cannot now be even the ghost of a chance for the Nizam to make his way to the Indian imperial throne, even if all the Frontier tribes are expected to come down to Hyderabad *en masse* to support him.

Just as the article in the 'Harijan' has told us the academical forecast of the masochistic school of Gandhist Hindus. even so the virile Hindu Sanghatanist also has weighed out his academical prospects. The Hindu Sanghatanist takes into account the millions of Hindus from Kashmere to the Cape, who are being animated by the pan-Hindu spirit.

He knows the hour of Hindu resurrection is struck, and the very dead bones of our heroic and even the very Hindu Princes, have stirred up wit and impulse. They cannot long remain unconcerned. Moslem Princes threaten a nation-wide Civil War.

The foremost of the Hindu Princes have realised that if Hindudom falls, the Hindu States too must fall with it. As defenders of Hindu faith and Hindu honour they form the reserved forces of Hindudom, organised centres of Hindu strength which even today will outweigh by far the utmost which a Hyderabad here or a Bhopal there can do to spite the Hindu cause.

From Udeipur, Jodhpur, Jaipur, Gwalior, Indore, Dhar, Dewas, Baroda to Kolhapur, it is almost an unbroken chain of Hindu Military camps of organised Hindu Governments, which animated by the new Hindu spirit, cannot but come forward in their own interests as well as those of Hindudom as a whole to defend the Hindu cause. Even Scindia alone, other things being equal, can smash up the Nizam on any new Udgir or Kharda field he chooses. Pressed by these overwhelming Hindu forces from the North and those of the Mysore, Travancore and Cochin in the South, the poor Nizam will simply be sandwiched between them and instead of winning back the ceded districts will have, on the contrary to cede whatever districts he already possesses today. There will not be left a trace of Moslem Rule from the Seas in the South to the Jamuna in the North.

But what of the Frontier tribes and Islamic Kingdoms outside India which are expected to help the 'faithful' in India to bring into being a new Moslem Empire—the Pakistan ?

Well, let the Pakistan alone,—the few '*Sthanas*' like your Afghanistan, Arbastan and even Turkastan are themselves getting thrown into a melting pot and they will have to thank their stars if they can help only themselves to survive the European onslaught. Even Nadirshahas and Ahamadshahas could not save the Moghul Empire of the 'faithfuls' in India in the heyday of their power from

If an academical probability is at all to be indulged in, of all factors that count today, His Majesty the King of Nepal, the scion of the Shisodias, alone has the best chance of winning the Imperial crown of India. Strange as it may seem, the English know it better than we Hindus do. So shrewd a politician and historian as Persival Langdon himself writes in the end of his voluminous work on Nepal :—" The fact is that the communal strife from one end of India to the other invests Nepal with an importance that it would be foolish to overlook."

" Englishmen should attempt to understand the high position which Nepal holds in the Southern Asiatic balance and the great and growing importance which she will possess in the future in the solution of the problems which beset the present state of India. Nepal stands today on the threshold of a new life. Her future calls her in one direction and one only. It is not impossible that Nepal may even be called upon to control the destiny of India itself. "

Even Britain will feel it more graceful that the Sceptre of Indian Empire, if it ever slips out of her grip, should be handed over to an equal and independent ally of Britain like His Majesty the King of Nepal than to one who is but a vassal and a vanquished potentate of Britain like the Nizam.

But we also repeat that all this is academic meant only to serve a virile antidote to the inferiority complex which the spineless academical forecast of Gandhiji betrays.

And yet, if but the Hindus realise and take stock of the inexhaustible resources of strength they have still at hand relatively to the Indian Moslems, resurvey them from a pan-Hindu angle of vision and take the field in time, they will find that much that sounds academic today could even be made actual and the racial dream of a consolidated, mighty and independent Nation could be realised sooner than they dare to expect !

SURRENDER TO MUSLIMS

Gandhiji is an expert in the science of surrender and the Indian Muslims are shrewd enough to gather fruits of his surrender. We are not speaking in an ironical vein, Gandhiji himself has written an article on 'the Science of Surrender' in 'Young India,' 9-7-1925, in which he says, "What a lover gives transcends justice. And yet it is always less than he wishes to give because he is anxious to give more and frets that he has nothing left." The public might well be aware of the fact that Gandhiji was prepared to give a 'blank cheque' to Indian Muslims at the Second Round Table Conference. But neither he nor the Muslims were satisfied with that gift. And hence Gandhiji has gone another step further on the path of surrender and is pledging the support of the Congress for the establishment of 'Muslim Raj' in India. The readers must not think that we are making baseless allegations. Gandhiji himself writes in 'Harijan' of 23-3-40, "It is the Muslims who will impose their will by force singly or with British assistance on an unresisting India. If I can carry the Congress with me I would not put the Muslims to the trouble of using force. I would be ruled by them for it would still be Indian rule." Now that Gandhiji has become the sole dictator of the Congress there is no question of the Congress going against him. Even in 1921 'The Citizen' an organ of the Liberals of Madras wrote in a prophetic vein, "The Ahmedabad Congress has made Mr. Gandhi dictator. Democracy may now hide its diminished head in shame. The thing was bound to come, history could not but repeat

itself. And a dictator today would become a traitor to-morrow. Circumstances are also tending in that direction."

The prophecy of the Madras Liberals is now being fulfilled. Gandhiji is travelling the path from dictatorship to treachery. The incipient dictator is turning out to be a Hindu Quisling. And this Hindu edition of the Norwegian original might prove to be more dangerous, on account of his power of hypnotising the masses. In a recent article on Hyderabad in 'Harijan,' 13-10-40 he says, "Thus H. E. H. the Nizam, will then be the chosen servant of people. Only then, his people will not be merely those continued willynilly within his present borders but may be all India. You must not dismiss this as a utopian scheme. I claim to be a practical man. If the Congress proves true to its policy, what may seem today to be an airy nothing may tomorrow become an agreeable reality." Gandhiji recognises that Nizam's rule will mean anarchy in India. Yet he unhesitatingly plumps for that anarchy. This preference for anarchy has a metaphysical reason behind it which is explained by Gandhiji in 'Harijan,' 7-10-1939 as follows: "I hold that for full play of non-violence only one party need believe in it. Indeed if both believe in it and live upto it there is no appreciation or demonstration of it. To live at peace with one another is the most natural thing to do. But neither party gains the merit that the exercise of non-violence carries with it."

From the above passage it will be clear that in order to gain spiritual merit for himself he is ready to plunge the whole country in a bloodbath. The responsible leaders of the country should consider whether they are prepared to stake the life of our nation for the idiocrasies of a Mahatma. The Hindus should realise that the role that is cast for them in the mad experiments of the Mahatma, is that of a non-violent victim. Gandhiji expresses in the same article

that "My principal work lies through teaching at least the Hindus to learn the art of non-violence." According to Gandhiji's philosophy it is better for the masses to be invaded by a foreign army than to be defended by a national army. And this is not a joke. For the ex-President of Gandhi Seva Sangh Mr. Mashruwala himself has written in 'Harijan' 4-11-1939, "The masses have really less to fear from invading armies than from the country's own armies." We suspect that the 'Gandhi Seva Sangh' is a factory for manufacturing Quislings. Even the much-maligned Machiavelli has remarked that "Peace is more burdensome for men that are enslaved than war is for men that are free." Gandhiji's scheme of non-violent defence of India is a natural corollary of the absurd proposition of Mr. Mashruwala. Fortunately for us the leading members of the Congress Working Committee do not believe in the above theory. But they do not realise the tragic consequences of following Gandhiji in spite of their disbelief in non-violence. For Gandhiji himself has declared in 'Harijan,' 14-10-1939, "So far as I can read the Working Committee's mind after a fairly full discussion, the members think that Congressmen are unprepared for non-violent defence against armed invasion. The tragedy of the situation is that if the Congress is to throw in its lot with those who believe in the necessity of armed defence of India the past 20 years will have been years of gross neglect of the primary duty of Congressmen to learn the science of armed warfare. And I fear that history will hold me as the general of the fight responsible for the tragedy. The future historian will say that I should have perceived that the nation was learning not non-violence of the strong but merely passivity of the weak and I should have therefore provided for Congressmens' military training. Being obsessed with the idea that somehow or other India will learn true

non-violence it would not occur to me to invite my co-workers to train themselves for armed defence. Nor am I even now repentant for the past." Being conscious of having emasculated the Hindus by his teaching Gandhiji is now preparing to hand us over to the insecure custody of Nizam, supported by the wild border tribes.

Even Gandhiji has some lucid moments in which he is conscious of the tragic consequences of his policy. During his fast of 1924, Mr. Mahadeo Desai asked him where his error lay for which he was doing that penance. To this question Gandhiji replied, " My error ? Why, I may be charged with having committed a breach of faith with the Hindus. I asked them to lay their lives and property at the disposal of the Mussalmans for the protection of their holy places. Even today I am asking them to practise Ahimsa to settle quarrels by dying but not killing. And what do I find to be the result ? How many temples have been desecrated ! How many sisters came to me with complaint ? As I was saying yesterday to Hakimji, Hindu women are in mortal terror of Mussalman goondas. In many places they fear to go out alone. I had a letter from.....How can I bear the way in which his little children were molested ? How can I now ask the Hindus to put up with every thing patiently ? I gave them the assurance that the friendship of Mussalmans was bound to bear good fruit. I asked them to befriend them regardless of the result. It is not in my power today to make good that assurance. Who listens to me ? And yet I must ask the Hindus even today to die and not to kill. I can only do so by laying down my life. " If he had died at that time we would have been rid of this pernicious canker eating into the vitals of the Hindu society.

Really speaking we do not understand why this Mahatma is so insistent on prescribing us non-violence. He does not

disbelieve in the right of might. He himself has declared in the "Science of Surrender." 'Might is right' is the last word of 'justice and nothing but justice.' This is not an off-hand statement. For, in 'Harijan' 21-10-39 he says, "The question therefore resolves itself into not who is numerically superior but who is stronger. Surely there is only one answer." It is because he believes in the strength of the Muslims that he is preaching the justice of Nizam's cause. We do not think that the Muslims are a match to the Hindus in any sense. Let there be a fair trial of strength between the Muslims and the Hindus unhampered by this pernicious doctrine of surrender and non-violence. Gandhiji also at one time believed in such a fair trial of strength. In 'Young India' 18-9-24 he says, "I hate duelling, but it has a romantic side to it. I am engaged in bringing that side of it to the fore. I would love to engage in a duel with the Big Brother. When we are both satisfied that there is no chance of Unity without bloodshed and that even we two, cannot agree to live in peace, I must then invite the Big Brother to a duel with me. I know that he can twist me round his thick fingers and dash me to pieces. That day Hinduism will be free. Or if he lets me kill him in spite of the strength of a giant, Islam in India will be free. He will have atoned for all the bullying by the average Musalman. What I detest is the match between goondas of both the parties. Any peace based upon such trial of strength will turn to bitterness in the end. The way to get rid of the Hindu cowardice is for the educated portion to fight the goondas. We may use sticks and other clean weapons. My Ahimsa will allow the use of them. We shall be killed in the fight but that will chasten both the Hindus and the Musalmans. That would remove the Hindu cowardice in a moment. As things are going each party will be the slaves of their own goondas.

That means dominance of the military power. England fought for the predominance of the civil power and won and lived. Lord Curzon did much harm to us. But he was certainly brave and right when he stood out for the predominance of civil authority. When Rome passed into the hands of the soldiery, it fell. My whole soul rises against the very idea of the custody of my religion passing into the hands of the goondas. Confining myself therefore for the present to the Hindus I must respectfully but earnestly warn the thinking Hindus against relying upon the assistance of goondas for the protection of their temples, themselves and their wives and children. With the weak bodies they have they must be determined to stand at their post and to die fighting or without fighting." While Gandhiji was thus earnestly advising the educated Hindus to organise for self-defence another great Hindu leader, Dr. Hedgewar of Nagpur tried to put this precept into practice by organising the wellknown "Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh." And yet Gandhiji has been ignoring this institution started with the avowed purpose of doing away with Hindu cowardice and strengthening the bonds of unity among the Hindus.

While stating the reasons of the weakness of Hindus in spite of their being in a majority Gandhiji in 'Harijan' 21-10-39, says, "Hinduism is an elastic, indefinable term and Hindus are not a homogeneous whole like Muslims and Christians." This statement betrays Gandhiji's gross ignorance of the latest movements for the regeneration of Hinduism. Hinduism is not an elastic and indefinable term but something positive and definite. Barr. Savarkar has clearly defined it, and Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh has clearly demonstrated that though divided by castes and creeds the Hindus are a homogeneous whole. As these facts have been proved, it is time for the Hindus to shed their inferiority complex.

Here we must draw the attention of the readers to a very important point. In his article on Hyderabad, Gandhiji has declared that 'the rule of the Nizam supported by the border Muslim tribes or chiefs feudatory to him would, in his estimation, be cent per cent domestic. It would be Home Rule.' Gandhiji's numerous followers are telling us on every occasion that they are willing to accept Muslim rule in India. But do they really know what Muslim rule means in practice? The Muslims in India are incapable to rule this vast country without Muslim help from outside. So, in practice, Muslim rule will mean, not the rule of the Indian Muslims but of those recruited from outside. This fact is, well illustrated by a reference to Akbar's so called national administration. W. H. Morland in an economic survey of India at the death of Akbar writes, " The service was not by any means confined to men of Indian Nationality and in Akbar's time it was predominantly foreign. The approximate composition of the service under Akbar can be ascertained from Blochmann's labourious notes to lists of Amirs and Mansabdars given by Abul Fazal; these lists include all appointments made during the reign to the ranks above 500, and also those holders of inferior rank who were alive when the 'Ain' was compiled about 1595. Omitting the small number of officers whose origin is not on record, I find that just under 70% of the remainder belonged to families which had either come to India with Humayun or had arrived at court after the accession of Akbar; the remaining 30% of the appointments were made by Indians rather more than half by Muslims and rather less than half by Hindus. Akbar has often been praised for the enlightened policy which offered such scope for advancement to his Hindu subjects and the praise is deserved provided that proper stress is laid on the element of policy. In the course of about 40 years he appointed in all 21 Hindus

to ranks above 500 but of these 17 were Rajputs. That is to say that a great majority of the appointments were made to consolidate his hold over the chiefs who submitted to his rule "

It has been established how Muslim rule is really foreign rule as regards the governing element. Now we shall prove how this rule will be entirely foreign so far as ideals and traditions are concerned. The anonymous Muslim author of 'The Confederacy of India' says " Ordinarily the formation of the Indusstan Federation may constitute a very attractive idea for the Muslims but perhaps it would be shorn of all its attractiveness if we were to explain to them all its implications and consequences. A Muslim state may not mean a state in the Western sense of the word to which the Indian Muslims have become accustomed. It may mean the purging of the Indian Muslims of all the un-Islamic influences which they have contracted on account of their close contact with the non-Muslim communities in India. It may also mean the establishment of a Bait-ul-mal and regular payment of zakat into it. It may as well require the Muslim agriculturists to forgo the protection which the Land Alienation Act provides to them in the Punjab and the N. W. F. Province against expropriation at the hands of the non-agricultural tribes. It may require some Muslim communities of Sind like Khojas and Kachhi Memons to give up the Hindu Law and instead be governed by the Mahomedan Law and of the Punjab to discard customary law and instead apply to themselves the Muslim Law of inheritance. It may mean many other things to which the Muslims may not be prepared. By mentioning this aspect of the proposed federation we do not mean to terrify the Muslims at its prospect. We refer to it simply in the interests of honest presentation of the subject and to point

out to them the fact that they have considerably wandered away from Islam." This appalling prospect of de-Indianisation is repellant to the ordinary Indian Muslims themselves. Yet their fanatical leaders are determined to force the Islamic Law in all its primitive ruthlessness upon their helpless followers. If the Muslim leaders can exhibit such utter callousness as regards the feelings of their co-religionists, what hope is there, of their being more considerate in dealing with the Hindus, whom they are pleased to call Kaffirs. The notorious 'Muslim Outlook' of Lahore, has already expressed its hope that the future Muslim rulers of India would continue the good work begun by Sultan Mahamud of Ghazni and Aurangzeb.

Before closing we must bring to the notice of the readers a remarkable criticism of Syed Abdul Latif's scheme by the anonymous Muslim author of 'The Confederacy of India' 'The author has conveniently closed his eyes to a few realities, namely, the All India National Congress and the well awakened Hindu Community while suggesting that a long strip of the country extending to the port of Madras and a large area around Calcutta which are prominently Hindu tracts, may be included in the Muslim Zones of Hyderabad and Bengal respectively.' The sequel has proved that the Syed of Hyderabad was asking too little instead of too much when such a champion of surrender was leading (or shall we say misleading) the Indian National Congress.

SHRADDHANAND versus GANDHIJI

SHAUKAT ALI'S PRANKS

[In this passage Swami Shraddhanand reveals how Shaukat Ali was preparing the ground for the final abandonment of non-violence.]

There is one particular fact about Maulana Shaukat Ali's doings, which I must relate here. Sitting on the dias in the Calcutta Special Session, Maulana Shaukat Ali, in the hearing of more than 50 persons, while the merits of non-violence were being discussed, said "Mahatma Gandhi is a shrewd Bania. You do not understand his real object. By putting you under discipline, he is preparing you for Guerilla warfare. He is not such an out-and-out non-violencist as you all suppose." I was shocked to hear all this from the big brother and remonstrated with him which he treated with humour. I had no occasion to talk to Mahatma Gandhi about it at Calcutta. Next came the ordinary session at Nagpur which I attended. There too I noticed the big Ali playing the same pranks. On that occasion I wanted to warn Mahatma Gandhi but unfortunately I was attacked with influenza and could not join the last sitting of the Session. Still I wrote to Mahatmajji telling of my inability to go to him and asked him to come to me because I had an important communication to make. He also pleaded his inability to get off from deputations from different provinces who came to see him and sent his Secretary, Shriyut Mahadeva Desai, instead. I gave him my message to Gandhiji saying that he ought to be on his guard because his motives were being misrepresented by his trusted colleagues. There was another prominent fact to which I drew the attention of Mahatma Gandhi. Both of us went together one night to the Khilafat

Conference at Nagpur. The Ayats (verses) of the Quran recited by Maulanas on that occasion contained frequent references to Jihad against and the killing of Kaffirs. But when I drew his attention to this phase of the Khilafat movement Mahatmaji smiled and said,

“They are alluding to the British bureaucracy.”

In reply I said that it was all subversive of the ideal of non-violence and when a revulsion of feeling came, the Mohammadan Maulanas would not refrain from using these verses against the Hindus.

—‘The Liberator’ 22-7-26



HISTORY OF THE WIRE TO AMANULLAH

In the middle of April 1921 when I was allowed by my medical adviser to leave my bed, to which I had been confined for three months and a half, they admonished me not to walk more than two furlongs a day, to lie down for rest as much as possible and not to undertake long night journeys. But the marriage of Pandit Motilal Nehru's daughter was to be celebrated in the beginning of May and all the Hindu and Muslim leaders were to be there. I could not absent myself and therefore went to Delhi first, from which place I started for Allahabad. I broke journey at Cawnpore and I mention this because I spoke there in a public meeting and exhorted non-violent non-co-operators not to nurse the thought of getting Swaraja within 12 months because if disappointed there might set in a reaction which would prostrate the whole nation for scores of years. I asked them to fight the battle of freedom to the very end and make proper preparations for it.

The next day I left for Allahabad by the Punjab Howrah Mail. Maulana Muhammad Ali was also travelling by the

same train and I got in his compartment. Our talk centred round the topic of the day. Sir William Vincent (then Home Member of the Government of India) had repeated from his safe place in the Legislative Assembly that he had documentary proofs shewing that Mr. Muhammad Ali was corresponding with the Kabul Government against the British. During that very period a second class leader of the moderate liberal party—because all of them were leaders ; there were no followers—told me that a letter intercepted by the C. I. D. was actually shown to Dr. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru purporting to have been written by Mr. Muhammad Ali. I gave the whole thing in the press and challenged the Government to publish a fascimile of the same in the papers so that the public might have an occasion to judge whether the letter was in the handwriting of Mr. Muhammad Ali at all. On his enquiring about the language in which the letter in dispute was written, I told him that it was alleged to be in Persian. M. Muhammad Ali exclaimed “ Then it could not be written by me. I am not only innocent of Arabic but cannot write a letter in correct Persian. Urdu poet though I am of some worth.” I could not then understand how a man, innocent of both the Arabic and the Persian language could obtain the degree of Maulana, but the riddle was solved when I read the following in the open letter addressed to Musalmans by the late Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow, the declared Murshid of the Ali Brothers. At page 35 he wrote :—

“ The diploma (sanad) of Maulana, which has been awarded to brother Maulana Muhammad Ali from Firangi Mahal was given on account of his discharge of duties of Tabligh (Conversions). In the Amritsar (Congress) Meeting, when all the topmost Hindu leaders were present, he gave the message of Islam by name to each one of them and moreover he gave the message of Islam to the Viceroy and through Lord Chelmsford to king George V. This was the

· duty of the Real Ulema (learned). When he (Maulana Muhammad Ali) discharged this duty on a grand scale, then from this place (Firangi Mahal) this title of exalted office was presented to him.”

It is a different matter, altogether, whether Mr. Muhammad Ali did really give the message of Islam to every topmost Hindu leader at Amritsar ; but when I asked Pandit Nehru and Malviya, the late lamented Deshbandhu C. R. Das and Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar and others, they denied having been addressed on this subject by the neo-Maulana. But these might have no place among the topmost Hindu leaders in the eyes of this Maulana. I, therefore, enquired of Mahatma Gandhi and he too denied having been personally approached by brother Muhammad Ali with this message.

Apologising to my readers for this digression which is by the way, I come to the point again. Maulana Muhammad Ali complained about political leaders taking him to task for sending a wire to the Sultan of Kabul urging him not to make peace with the British Government. I, too, urged that it was not a wise step that he had taken. He kept quiet at the time but when we reached the Anand Bhavan (Pandit Nehru's palace), brother Muhammad Ali took me aside and taking out a paper from his hand-bag, gave a draft of a telegram to me to read. What was my astonishment when I saw the draft of the self-same telegram in the peculiar handwriting of the Father of the non-violent non-co-operation movement ?

Mahatma Gandhi reached Anand Bhavan on the next morning. It was his day of Maunavrata. When I went to see him, he handed over to me a letter and a telegram which he had received from Pandit Malviyaji. The purport of the letter was that Lord Reading was a very good man in fact a saint and he appeared to be ready to give all the Reforms which the Indians wanted ; so brother Gandhi should make

haste to go to Simla to have an interview with him (Lord Reading). The telegram simply urged the necessity of Gandhiji's going to Simla with a loving threat that Malviyaji would have to leave the cool breeze of Simla for the burning heat of Allahabad if he did not assent to go to Simla.

I told Gandhiji not to go without consulting the Working Committee of the Congress, which had been called for the next evening. The reasons which I then gave to dissuade Gandhiji from going to see Lord Reading need not be repeated here. They were repeated by Babu Ramananda Chatterji in the Modern Review.

Then came brother Andrews from Simla the same afternoon and after embracing me gave such a glowing account of his interview with the late Lord Chief Justice of Great Britain that all present were charmed. But I began a heartless cross-examination which elicited the fact that the astute diplomat had been reading the simple heart of the man of faith like an open book while keeping his own heart and mind completely closed to the eyes of his interviewer. Well, I gave my warning and my duty was discharged. Mahatmaji could not pay the least attention to my warning because he had full faith in his invincibility and as regards consulting the Working Committee he never thought of it. Mahatmaji went to Simla, he was made to sign a typed letter, addressed to the Private Secretary asking for an interview with the Viceroy and actually met Lord Reading. The upshot of that meeting is known all over the world. The astute diplomat took every advantage of the Saint's sincerity and simplicity and if Gandhiji's trial of truthfulness and the preservation of the sanctity of vow appeared with resplendent brightness, the actual mundane trophies of war remained in the hands of the man of the world.

—'The Liberator' 29-7-26



GANDHI CONFIRMS THE MESSAGE

Mr. Gandhi addressed the Allahabad District Conference in the following manner held under the presidentship of Maulana Mohamed Ali :—

He could not understand why the Ali Brothers were going to be arrested as the rumour went, and why he was to remain free. They had done nothing, which he would not do. If they had sent a message to the Amir he also would send one, to inform the Amir that if he came no Indian as long as he, Mr. Gandhi, could help it, would help the Government to drive him back. If a man was true to his religion no Afghan or any power on earth could make him transgress his religious precepts. He knew he could not as yet control the actions of all Indians, but he knew many would not help the Government against the Amir as long as it would not grant "Swaraj" and redress the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs. He called upon the audience to do nothing against the dictates of Congress. They must report their grievances to the Khilafat and Congress Committees and act according to the instructions received.

—'Leader' 12-5-21



OUR NEIGHBOURS

The following article from 'Young India' contains the clearest evidence of Gandhi's treason. In this article he orders the non-cooperators to pray for the defeat of the Government of India, in case of an Afghan invasion and declares that nothing can prevent them from overrunning India if they wished to.]

"Is not my article on the Afghan Bogey an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border, and thus do I not become a direct party to violence?" Thus asks Mr. Andrews. "My article was written for Indians and for the Government. I do not believe the Afghans to be so foolish as to invade India on the strength of my article. But I see that it is capable of bearing the interpretation put upon it by Mr.

Andrews. I therefore hasten to inform all whom it may concern that not only do I not want to invite the Afghans or anybody else to come to our assistance, but am anxious for them not to come to our assistance. I am quite confident of India's ability to settle with the Government without extraneous help. Moreover I am interested in demonstrating the perfect possibility of attaining our end only by non-violent means." I would therefore strain every nerve to keep the Afghans out of the Indian border, but my anxiety to keep them off the Indian border will not go so far as to assist the Government with men or money.

In my article I have put my position as clearly as possible. For me the existing Government is the most intolerable of all, it is the greatest danger to the manhood of India and I would welcome its *re-formation* at any cost. It is my settled conviction that it is a Godless Government. That there are good Englishmen and good Indians connected with it makes it all the more dangerous for India. It keeps the nation's eyes off the inherent evil of it. My attack is not against individuals, it is directed against the system, against the aggregate called the Government. The best of Viceroys have been powerless to eradicate the poison of the system. The poison is its foundation. Therefore I can reconcile myself to all the worst that can happen to India in the place of the present system.

What however I would do is totally different from what I can do. I am sorry to have to confess that the movement has not yet acquired such hold on the soldier class as to embolden them to refuse assistance to the Government in time of need. When the soldier class has realised that they live for the nation, and that it is a travesty of a soldier's calling when he undertakes to kill to order, the battle of India's worldly freedom is won without more. As it is,

the Indian soldier is as much subject to fear as the layman. He fills the recruiting ranks because he believes that there is no other means of livelihood. The Government has made the profession of killing attractive by a system of special rewards, and by a system of skilfully devised punishments has made it well-nigh impossible for the soldier, once he is in, to get out without difficulty. In these circumstances I do not delude myself with the belief that the British Government will be without Indian help in the event of an immediate Afghan invasion. But it was my duty, especially when challenged, to put before the nation the position logically arising from Non-co-operation. It was necessary too, to warn the nation against being frightened by the Afghan bogey.

The second part of the question contains, in my opinion, a misconception of non-violence. It is no part of the duty of a non-violent non-co-operator to assist the Government against war made upon it by others. A non-violent non-co-operator may not secretly or openly encourage or assist any such war. He may not take part directly or indirectly in it. But it is no part of his duty to help the Government to end the war. On the contrary his prayer would be, as it must be, for the defeat of a power which he seeks to destroy. I, therefore, so far as my creed of non-violence is concerned, can contemplate an Afghan invasion with perfect equanimity, and equally so far as India's safety is concerned. The Afghans have no quarrel with India. They are a God-fearing people. I warn non-co-operators against judging the Afghans by the few savage specimens we see in Bombay or Calcutta. It is a superstition to suppose that they will overrun India if the British post at the frontier was withdrawn. Let us remember that there is nothing to prevent them from overrunning India today, if they wished to. But they are as fond of their country as we claim to be fond of

ours. I must devote a separate article to an examination of the difficult problem that faces the residents near the frontier.

—'Young India' 18-5-21



MORE CALUMNY

[In this passage Gandhiji denies Swami Shraddhanand's allegations in a most unconvincing manner. The contrast between this answer and the previous article proves that Oscar Wilde had no reason to lament for "The Decay of Lying."]

Q.—You did not hesitate to join the Ali Brothers in their intrigue to invite Amanullah Khan to invade India and set up Muslim Raj. You drafted a wire for Maulana Mahomed Ali advising the then Amir not to enter into a treaty with the British. The late Swami Shraddhanandji is reported to have seen the draft. And now you want the Hindus of Sind to make a present of their hearths and homes to their Mussalman oppressors instead of demanding the re-amalgamation of Sind with the Bombay Province, which alone can restore the reign of law to Sind. Why won't you realise that in this age of enlightenment and progress what the minorities expect is effective protection of their due rights, not mere pious counsels of perfection?

A.—*I have several such letters. Hitherto I have ignored them. But now I see that the news has gone through a revised and enlarged edition in the Hindu Mahasabha. An angry correspondent threatens that persons like him will begin to believe what has been stated so authoritatively. For the sake of my reputation, therefore, I must answer the question. But my correspondents should know that life for me would be a burden if I were to make it a point of controverting every false report about me or distortion of my writing. A reputation that requires such a mud-wall of protection is not worth keeping. So far as the charge*

of my intriguing with the Amir is concerned I can say that there is no truth whatsoever in it. Further, I know that the Brothers stoutly denied the charge when it was brought to their notice. And I believed them implicitly. I do not remember having drafted any telegram on behalf of Maulana Mahomed Ali to the then Amir. The alleged telegram is harmless in itself and does not warrant the deduction drawn from it. The late Swamiji never referred the matter to me for confirmation. It is wrong to say anything against dead men unless one has positive proof and stating it is relevant. The romance has been woven round my writings in 'Young India.' Deductions drawn from them are wholly unjustified. I would not be guilty of inviting any power to invade India for the purpose of expelling the English. For one thing, it would be contrary to my creed of non-violence. For another, I have too great a respect for English bravery and arms to think that an invasion of India can be successful without a strong combination of different powers. In any case, I have no desire to substitute British Rule with any other foreign rule. I want unadulterated Home Rule, however, inferior in quality it may be. My position remains today what it was when I wrote the 'Young India' paragraphs now sought to be used against me. Let me further remind the readers that I do not believe in secret methods.

As for Sind my advice stands. Reincorporation of Sind in the Bombay Province may or may not be a good proposition on other grounds, but certainly it is not for the purpose of greater protection of life and property. Every Indian, be he Hindu or any other, must learn the art of protecting himself. It is the condition of real democracy. The State has a duty. But no State can protect those who will not share with it the duty of protecting themselves.

On the way to Delhi.

—'Harijan' 4-2-40

Pre-war Conspiracies of the Indian Muslims

In this chapter we propose to relate the history of the pre-war Muslim conspiracies for the purpose of establishing Muslim Raj in India. The readers will not otherwise realise how deep rooted these conspiracies have been. It is a well-known fact that all the plots of Muslims find support in their Scriptures. According to an injunction of Islam, the Muslims must reside in that country alone which is Dar-ul-Islam or which is Dar-ul-Aman, meaning those countries where Islamic Raj has been established or those in which Islam can be practised without fear. Also it is expressly stated in their religious books that they must not reside in those countries where Islam does not rule or where there is no free scope to practise Islam. If the Islamic supremacy in a nation is destroyed or if certain restrictions are imposed on the practice of Islam then the Muslims must either leave that country or revolt against the new rule. No less an authority than A. K. Azad, the present Congress President has said, "Against the non-Muslim Government, Islam prescribes only sword, protracted battle and the cutting of throats." Their religion has classed the nations in three categories. Dar-ul-Islam which is the land of Islam, Dar-ul-Aman where Islam can be practised freely, and that nation where restrictions are imposed on Islam is Dar-ul-Harab or battlefield. According to the Muslim Scriptures, India is neither Dar-ul-Islam, nor Dar-ul-Aman. In a meeting of the Central Legislature on 26-8-38, Kaji Mahomed Ahamad Kajimi, a follower of the late Mahomad Ali, frankly says, "After the abolition of the posts of Quazis in 1864, we find that the real

agitation started In India. It was at that time that continuous agitation was carried on by the Mussalmans and they decided that India was not Dar-ul-Islam, it ceased to be Dar-ul-Aman and it was Dar-ul-Harab. Even up till today certain of our prayers are offered on the basis that it is Dar-ul-Harab."

Criticising these utterances of Kajimi, Suresh-Chandra Deo remarks in the I. A. R., " Here we think we get an inside view of the mind of the Muslims in India, who under the influence of old-world ideas are being taught everyday of their life in their mosques that India is a country of enmity. We have been told of a sect among the Muslims of Bengal about 30 lakhs strong to whom congregational prayers are prohibited, owing to an injunction of Quran. Because in enemy countries, the life of the faithful assembled in a congregation for prayer was likely to be exposed to attacks leading to mass massacre. This daily repetition of India being an enemy country, the offering of daily prayers based on the thought or belief that India was Dar-ul-Harab, this practice creates and starts those mental processes that make the Muslims in India so impatient, that make possible that outburst of violence of thought and action at the slightest of occasions. "

Now, do we really understand how these riots fomented by Muslims originate in mosques. When once Muslims have decided that India is Dar-ul-Harab, a battle field, then they are either to conquer it or run away from the battle field. Of these two paths, that of leaving India, or Hijrat has been proved unsuccessful according to the results of 1921. Hence those faithful Muslims have but only one way and that is 'Jihad.' In fact the Muslims have declared Jihad on India from 1824. For the Rowlatt Committee members, while describing the genesis of Islamic conspiracies say, " Saiyad Ahmad, who had begun life as a soldier of fortune, adopted Wahabri docti-

nes, visited Mecca in 1822, returned to India, where he acquired a following at various places in the Gangetic plane, and in 1824 appeared among the mountain tribes on the Peshawar border, preaching Jihad or war against the Sikh Kingdom of the Punjab. Together with his adherents, he founded a Colony which, although small, has survived many vicissitudes and remains until now. It has frequently been assisted by recruits and funds from Co-religionists in this country.... Its members regard India as a land not governed by Muslims and therefore unfit for Muslim habitation, a land of the enemy (Dar-ul-Harab). They have always preached Jihad. They have always kept in touch with and drawn support from a secret organisation of friends in India. During the troubles of 1857, they were joined by a number of mutineers and endeavoured unsuccessfully to bring about a general frontier attack. Later on, they took part in various border wars and in 1915 were concerned in the rising, which led up to the engagements at Rustam and Shabkadr." They further state, "The flight of the fifteen students from Lahore in February 1915, was a visible sign that there are in this country, as there were fifty years ago, a few Mahomedans who teach that the way of salvation lies in waging war against the infidel Government of India either personally or by recruiting for or sending money to the Mujahidin. This fact has been established by other evidence. In January 1917, it was discovered that a party of eight Mahomedans had joined the Mujahidins from the districts of Rangpur and Dacca in Eastern Bengal. In March 1917, two Bengali Mahomedans were arrested in the North-West Frontier Province with Rs. 8000, in their possession, which they were conveying to the fanatical colony."

It has now been established from Rowlatt Report that there is a fanatical colony of Muslims on the Frontier who

propagate in favour of 'Jihad' and that there is a secret organisation in India which aids this colony, in men and money. Now it is proper to state as to who were the people that supported this fanatical colony in men. This information can be had from 'India as I knew it' of Sir Michel Odwayer the then Governor of Punjab. We now quote this information as stated in our 'Ladhai Rajkaran.' "In 1914, a Muslim Educational Conference was held at Rawalpindi. Among others extremist Muslims like Mahomed Ali and Mr. Abul Kalam Azad attended this conference. When this conference was over some of them went to Peshawar and some to Lahore. There these leaders addressed private meetings of students, or injected them with their views at tea parties. After the departure of these leaders Sir Michel Odwayer came to know much about their activities. In February 1915, 15 students from Lahore and many others from Peshawar and Kohat ran away from their homes as is obvious from Rowlatt Report. These fugitives had first been to the colony of fanatics." Having stained their hands in this affair the above mentioned Maulanas were arrested in 1915 under D. I. A. The readers can well realise as to the part played by our present, Rashtrapati in anti-national conspiracies. Further light is shed on the above affair by a statement of A. K. Azad quoted from the 'Leader' of 3-6-21.

"Regarding the Afghan Bogey the Maulana thinks that the man who saw Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya at Benaras was not from Kabul but from India itself and was sent by Moulvi Niamutullah, the chief of the old Indian Mujahidins of Bunair, in the N. W. Frontier. The Maulana says that in March 1920 this man saw him too in Bombay when he (the Maulana) was there for the Congress and Khilafat conferences just after his release from internment."

Even before the outbreak of war the Muslim leaders

were engaged in conspiring with Turkey. In 1912 Indian Muslims had raised a fund to aid the Turks. In order to hand over the sum Maulana Jaffarali of Lahore had been to Istambul personally. A carpet from Khalifa was presented to the Badashahi Mosque of Lahore through his consul general Khalil Khalid Bey, who had been to India in the early months of 1914. In 1912 Dr. Ansari had been to Istambul to serve the injured Turk soldiers. In return two doctors from Turkey came to India and we can clearly guess their activities from Rowlatt Report "Through influences of this kind, the outbreak of the war found a small section of Punjab Muslims out of humour with the British Government."

One can now realise how close must have been the contact of Azad (once a Turk citizen) with the Turkish emissaries.

This being the history of pre-war Muslim conspiracies, it is no wonder that Khilafat leaders demanded help from Amir Amanulla, in 1920-21.

WARTIME TREACHERY

Bhai Paramanand in his introduction to the History of Hindu Mahasabha observes, "The alliance between Mahatma Gandhi and the Ali Brothers, forms in my opinion one of the most unfortunate episodes, in the recent history of Hindusthan." The alliance is not only woeful but also very instructive. It deserves a careful study.

Before we analyse the friendship between Gandhiji and his dear Brothers, let us first study Gandhiji's psychology. Gandhiji is a theist, a devout Vaishnav, worshipping God as a beloved worships her Lover. This peculiar trait in his mentality is well illustrated in a book edited by Sir Radhakrishnan. This trait and the psychology behind it are met at every step in his career and politics. A specific instance of this tendency is quoted by Mr. Indulal Yagnik in his work 'Gandhiji as I know him.' Gandhiji was standing as a witness before the Hunter Committee.

"To a question by Sir Chimanlal if a high degree of saintliness and spiritual culture was not required to enable one to suffer without rancour and resentment, Mr. Gandhi promptly replied, "Sir Chimanlal, every woman suffers yet every woman is not a saint." This episode throws a flood of light on Gandhiji's mental make-up. He also displays his sophistic bias in his reply. Unlike other Vaishnavas he is a 'sophist' out and out.

Women are always ambitious to convert and ennoble men of sinful life by their magnetic influence. In his school

days Gandhiji tried a similar experiment on a vicious student. They became fast friends. In his autobiography Gandhiji makes a reference to this event. He told his mother and brother "I know he has the weaknesses you attribute to him, but you do not know his virtues. He cannot lead me astray as my association with him is meant to reform him." This manifests another besetting sin of Gandhiji, *viz.* his pompous vanity. As a result of that friendship, contracted in defiance of the advice given by his elders, Gandhiji was on the point succumbing to the evil influences. He was saved from the mishap by his good luck. Gandhiji's friendship with the Muslims belongs to the same category. He says in his autobiography:—

"I was seeking the friendship of good Mussalmans and was eager to understand the Mussalman mind through contact with their purest and most patriotic representatives. I therefore never needed any pressure to go with them *wherever they took me* in order to get into intimate touch with them."

In those days he did not realise the fact that he was seeking a mirage. There was hardly any Mussalman who was religious and at the same time patriotic—a lover of India. After twenty years' experience he may have made the painful discovery, but his vanity is so strong that he would never acknowledge the truth.

Gandhiji remarks further on, "Next I opened correspondence with the Government for the release of the Brothers. In that connection I studied the Brothers' views and activities about the Khilafat. I had discussions with Mussalman friends. I felt that if I would become a true friend of the Muslims, I must render all possible help in securing the release of the Brothers and a just settlement of the Khilafat question."

We have to remember that Ali Brothers were strong

protagonists of pan-Islamic movement. Gandhiji became their friend with a view to understand the Muslim mind. He wanted to convert them into patriotic Indians. In his attempt to fuse Islam with Indian Nationalism Gandhiji himself became its mortal enemy. He lost his nationalism.

Let us survey the situation in India, when Gandhiji took the fatal decision of striving, for the release of Ali Brothers and the resurrection of the Khilafat.

In the year 1917, when the Government had decided to release Mrs. Besant, they were willing to let off Ali Brothers too on certain conditions. One Mr. Abdul Majid, a high officer in C. I. D. was deputed to Chhindwada where the Brothers were interned. He interviewed the Brothers and communicated the official formula for their release. It ran thus:—

“I shall abstain during the remainder of the war from doing, writing or saying anything intended or reasonably likely to encourage or assist the enemies of the King Emperor. (Turkey, the head of the Islamic countries and the centre of pan-Islamic movement was at war with England then). I shall also abstain from doing, writing or saying any thing, intended or reasonably likely to be construed as an attack upon the allies and friends of the King Emperor.

“I also promise to abstain from violent or unconstitutional agitation which is likely to affect the public safety. The abstentions promised above are not intended to cause me to refrain from participation in politics within constitutional limits.”

The second condition is important inasmuch as it suggests the intrigues in which Ali Brothers were actively engaged when they were free.

Ali Brothers added their rider to the above formula.

“We understand and base the above undertaking on

the clear understanding that the abstentions promised above, are not intended to restrict in the slightest measure our freedom to observe all our religious duties as Mussalmans."

Government did not accept the rider as it nullified the formula and left the Brothers free to follow the dictates of their Khalifa and the Fatwas of Mullas and Moulavis. The Brothers were not released.

In order to grasp the implications contained in the rider which on its face appears quite innocuous we quote an incident from the History of Afghanistan by Sir George Mac-Mun. During the Great War of 1914, the Turkish Ambassador went to Kabul to solicit the help of the Amir. The Amir replied—

"But a good Muslim am I and what the Khalifa (the Emperor of Turkey) wills is mine to do. I await the Turkish armies on their way to India and I shall be ready to lead the hosts of Islam by their side."

To a good Muslim the command of the Khalifa, who is the supreme religious authority of Islam, is sacrosanct and inviolable. The Amir Habibullah was a pious Muslim. So were Ali Brothers. Whenever there is a conflict between the two loyalties, the loyalty to one's own country and the loyalty to the Khalifa, a good Muslim has to turn a traitor to the country and obey the spiritual authority. Ali Brothers were imprisoned by Government when engaged in fulfilling devoutly their duty as pious Muslims. Nationalism in India is incompatible with the idea of Islam.

Mr. Ghate, the pleader of Ali Brothers in his open letter to Mrs. Besant observes :—

"There are two letters which were clearly stated to have persuaded the Government of India at the last moment, not to restore their alleged authors to liberty. One of these is stated to be a letter written to His Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan by Mr. Mahomed Ali in Persian—a language in which I understand he cannot and has never attempted to compose. In this he is alleged to have asked the Amir to

invade India. It is stated that this letter was actually received by his Majesty and then sent to Government through a special messenger."

The Brothers declared the letter to be a forgery. The partisans of Ali Brothers including Gandhiji persist in saying that it must be a forged letter for the simple reason that Ali Brothers declare it to be one. Can credulity go further?

We beg to quote an extract from the Historic State Trial of Ali Brothers and Five Others. Ali Brothers were arrested for treason and tried at Karachi. During the course of the trial we read (vide page 255).

" Here Mr. Mahomed Ali quoted a letter which he had sent to the Viceroy when he was in jail, concerning the Afghan war, pointing out that Muslims could not help the Government against the Afghans but on the contrary were bound by their religion to sympathise with the latter, unless it was clearly shown that the Afghan War was not the outcome of the treatment meted out by the British Government to the Khilafat, but was an act of aggression pure and simple on the part of the Afghans.

"He said that the Viceroy never hanged him for that but on the contrary let him off and even arranged for his passage to England to educate the British public on the matter of the Khilafat. "

A man who is capable of writing in this vein to the Viceroy may protest vociferously that his letter requesting the Amir of Afghanistan to invade India is a downright forgery. Would any sane person ever believe in his protests?

In a speech delivered at Karachi, Mahomed Ali had discussed the ethics of his promises. He maintained that there are occasions when our opponents have no right to complain that we are untrue to our pledged word. He

explained to what extent he was going to carry out the promises given to Lord Reading. Says he "Today no Englishman has any right to enquire from us whether or not we shall stick to our promise until and unless those promises are fulfilled which are given to the whole world by Loyd George and which all have been falsified; until and unless those promises are fulfilled which were made by Lord Hardinge during the War."

The inference to be drawn is clear. So long as the British Government do not fulfil their promises to the Muslims, the latter are not expected to be very scrupulous about their pledges. The Maulana was perfectly right in taking up this attitude. Nobody can blame him for adopting this stand in matters of politics. The point is, can Gandhiji associate himself intimately with men who profess such ideas of relative morality? Are they not destructive of absolute truth which he preaches to the world? How can he embrace them as his brothers?

We may grant that Mahomed Ali could not write a letter in Persian, but that does not prove that the letter he sent to the Amir of Afghanistan was not his letter. The mother of Mahomed Ali did not know English but she did not repudiate the English letters written by Mr. Ghate, the pleader, at her instance.

We can adduce a circumstantial evidence regarding the genuineness of the letter. If it was not Mahomed Ali's, who forged it? Certainly it cannot be the Government of India. They had nothing to gain by this forgery. On the other hand if people learnt that such a letter was in the possession of the Government, the Amir, who was friendly to them, ran the risk of losing his life. We must peep a little into the History of Afghanistan to understand this intricate problem. In October 1915 a Turko-German deputation arrived at Kabul. It egged on the Afghan Government,

to invade India. At this time the Afghans, who are noted for their religious zeal, were heart and soul with the Turkish people. Amir Habibullah found himself between two fires. He was a friend of the Government of India who paid him a handsome subsidy. The Turks were his co-religionists and they were in danger. The Amir was forced to sign a treaty against his wishes with the Germans and the Turks. Afterwards the Amir took a memorable step, Sardar Iqbal Ali Shah, the Afghan Historian refers to it as follows:—

“Meantime Amanullah’s father, one dark night called the Moslem representative of Britain at Kabul and exhorted him to communicate his message in utmost secrecy, more or less in the following terms. “Tell your Government that I am their loyal friend. They ought to believe in me; and if in any of my actions or utterances they see anything contrary to this idea, tell them that that is being done on purpose. My position is very delicate.”

It is surmised that with a view to convince the Government of India of his absolute sincerity and fidelity, he handed over to the representative, the confidential letters that he had received from the Indian Muslim conspirators at the same time. When the Afghan subjects of Habibullah got an inkling of this secret interview they were enraged. Iqbal Ali Shah says “Habibullah thenceforward was a marked man, one in whom the nation had no confidence.”

The Afghans were already highly displeased with the Amir because he had refused to invade India in accordance with the wishes of the Khalifa. If over and above this they had known that he supplied the British Government, who were at war with the Khalifa, the secret documents of the pan-Islamist conspirators, there was every likelihood of an immediate revolution in Afghanistan. The Government of India kept mum over the letter of Mahomed Ali in order to save their friend, the Amir. But when Mr. Montagu assumed the office of the Secretary of State for India, the friends of

Ali Brothers pressed the Government of India for their release. The Rajah of Mahamudabad, a friend of Mahomed Ali was informed by the Government in confidence of some of the intrigues of Mahomed Ali; Mahomed Ali got the news of Habibullah's secret through the Rajah, his friend. Mr. Ghate, the pleader of Mahomed Ali wrote an open letter to Mrs. Besant stating therein the charges preferred by the Government against his client. Mr. Ghate attempted to rebut these charges towards the close of 1917. Dr. Ansari issued a pamphlet in defence of Mahomed Ali in the year 1918. It contained Mr. Ghate's letter. The pamphlet had an all India circulation. Since the publication of the pamphlet there were attempts to assassinate Habibullah. By the end of 1918 on the occasion of his birthday, the Amir was fired at. The bullet missed its target. The attempt proved abortive; but the criminal could not be traced by the Afghan Police. At last the Amir was murdered at midnight in February 1919. When we reflect on this sequence of events, we come to the conclusion that the Government were quite justified in their discretion. The moment they revealed the secret of the Amir to the Rajah of Mahamudabad, their friend's life was jeopardised.

Sir Shankaran Nair, an ex-President of the Congress and a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council was also convinced that a conspiracy was being hatched by Mahomed Ali in conjunction with the Afghan Government. We can prove it from the interview which Mrs. Besant had with the Viceroy in connection with the release of Ali Brothers. Referring to this interview Mrs. Besant remarks,

“H. E. the Viceroy was willing to listen to every argument I could urge, and encourage the most complete frankness of speech, but he refused to regard my own case as on all fours with (she had been interned by the Govt. and later on released.) that of Mahomed Ali. The one was